

**THE RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAITS WITH
ENGLISH SPEAKING ANXIETY AND
ENGLISH SPEAKING SELF-EFFICACY**

Haldun Vural

Ph.D. DISSERTATION

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

GAZI UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

FEBRUARY, 2017

TELİF HAKKI VE TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

Bu tezin tüm hakları saklıdır. Kaynak göstermek koşuluyla tezin teslim tarihinden itibaren(.....) ay sonra tezden fotokopi çekilebilir.

YAZARIN

Adı: Haldun

Soyadı: Vural

Bölümü: İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

İmza:

Teslim tarihi:

TEZİN

Türkçe Adı: KİŞİLİK ÖZELLİKLERİ İLE İNGİLİZCE KONUŞMA KAYGISI VE İNGİLİZCE KONUŞMA ÖZ-YETERLİĞİ ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

İngilizce Adı: THE RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAITS WITH ENGLISH SPEAKING ANXIETY AND ENGLISH SPEAKING SELF-EFFICACY

ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI

Tez yazma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyduđumu, yararlandıđım tüm kaynakları kaynak gösterme ilkelerine uygun olarak kaynakçada belirttiđimi ve bu bölümler dışındaki tüm ifadelerin şahsıma ait olduđunu beyan ederim.

Yazar Adı Soyadı: Haldun Vural

İmza:

JÜRİ ONAY SAYFASI

Haldun Vural tarafından hazırlanan “THE RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAITS WITH ENGLISH SPEAKING ANXIETY AND ENGLISH SPEAKING SELF-EFFICACY” adlı tez çalışması aşağıdaki jüri tarafından oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı’nda Doktora tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi

Başkan: Prof. Dr. Abdülvahit ÇAKIR

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi

Üye: Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı, Selçuk Üniversitesi

Üye: Doç. Dr. Kemal Sinan ÖZMEN

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi, Gazi Üniversitesi

Üye: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Neslihan ÖZKAN

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi, Ufuk Üniversitesi

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 07/02/2017

Bu tezin Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı’nda Doktora tezi olması için şartları yerine getirdiğini onaylıyorum.

Prof. Dr. Ülkü ESER ÜNALDI

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I may give thanks for Thy favor during this tiring period.

I would like to extend my gratitude, appreciation and thanks to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE and to Prof. Dr. Abdulvahit ÇAKIR for their brilliant comments and suggestions, and for their trust in me during my study.

I would also like to thank with all my heart to my dear wife, Ms. Ayla Vural, and my children Glsm Hatice, Himmet Yunus and Handan for supporting me for everything and for all of the inspiration and sacrifices they made on my behalf. I hope they accept my apologies for the time I could not spend with them.

KİŞİLİK ÖZELLİKLERİ İLE İNGİLİZCE KONUŞMA KAYGISI VE İNGİLİZCE KONUŞMA ÖZ-YETERLİĞİ ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

(Doktora Tezi)

Haldun Vural

GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Şubat, 2017

ÖZ

Türk insanı genellikle yabancılarla konuşmaya çok istekli görünmemektedir. Bu onların yabancıları şahsen tanımamalarından veya onların yanında kendilerini rahat hissetmemelerinden veya utangaç olmalarından, konuşurken kaygı duymalarından veya konuşmaya yeterlikleri olmadığını düşündüklerinden kaynaklanabilir. Bu gerçek, üniversitede İngilizce eğitimi alan öğrenciler için de geçerlidir. Türkiye'deki üniversitelerde okuyan öğrencilerin iletişim becerilerinin zayıflığı bu utangaçlık, yüksek yabancı dil konuşma kaygısı ve düşük konuşma öz-yeterliğiyle açıklanabilir. Dolayısıyla, yabancı dil konuşma kaygısının kişilik ve yabancı dil konuşma öz-yeterliğiyle bağlantılı olduğu söylenebilir. Diğer bir deyişle İngilizce öğretmenleri öğrencilerinin kişilik özelliklerini bilirse onları daha iyi anlayıp, İngilizce konuşma kaygılarının sebeplerinin kişilikleriyle ilgili olup olmadığını bulabilir ve daha etkili öğretim teknik ve metotları uygulayabilirler. Ana dilde konuşma kaygısı, kişilik özellikleri ve konuşma öz-yeterliğiyle alakalı pek çok araştırma olmasına rağmen yabancı dil öğreniminde bu tür araştırmalar çok yoktur. Yabancı dil öğreniminde en yaygın problemler arasında konuşma kaygısı ve öz-yeterliği sayılabilir. Kişilik özellikleri ile alakalı çalışmalara göre bu faktörler eğitim, doğru müdahale vb. yollarla değiştirilebilir ancak hangi kişilik özelliklerinin hangi

ölçülerde konuşma kaygısı ve öz-yeterliliğiyle alakalı olduğunun belirlenmesi gerekir. Mevcut çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye’deki değişik üniversitelerde eğitim alan 4. sınıf İngiliz Dili Eğitimi ile İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü öğrencilerinin kişilik özelliklerini tespit etmek; iki bölüm öğrencilerinin kişilik özellikleri arasında anlamlı farklar olup olmadığını bulmak; iki bölüm öğrencilerinin yabancı dil konuşma kaygı düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir fark olup olmadığını araştırmak; öğrencilerin yabancı dil konuşma kaygılarıyla kişilik özellikleri ve yabancı dil konuşma öz-yeterlilikleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek ve öğrencilerin kişilik özellikleri ile yabancı dil konuşma öz-yeterliliklerinin, onların yabancı dil konuşma kaygılarını anlamlı yordayıp yordamadığını bulmaktır. Mevcut çalışma karşılaştırmalı ve korelasyon özellikleri taşıyan nicel araştırma yöntemi ile yapılmıştır. Veriler üç ayrı anket (Büyük Beşli, Yabancı Dil Sınıf Kaygısı Ölçeği ve İngilizce Konuşma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği) ile toplanmıştır. Katılımcılar Türkiye’deki 31 farklı üniversitenin 923 İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümü son sınıf öğrencisi ile 922 İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü son sınıf öğrencileridir. Toplam katılımcı sayısı 1845’tir. Sonuçlar kişilik özellikleri sıralamasının İngiliz Dili Eğitimi ve İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümleri için aynı olduğunu göstermiştir. Sadece İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü puanları daha düşüktür. Her iki grup için de birinci kişilik özelliği Uyumluluktur; diğerleri ise sırasıyla Deneyime Açıklık, Sorumluluk, Dışadönüklük ve Duygusal Dengedir. Ayrıca iki bölümün kişilik özellikleri puanları arasında anlamlı bir farklılık da tespit edilmiştir. Sonuçlar aynı zamanda İngiliz Dili Eğitimi grubunun yabancı dil konuşma kaygı düzeyinin İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı grubundan düşük olduğunu göstermiştir; yani İngilizce konuşmada İngiliz Dili Eğitimi öğrencileri İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı öğrencilerinden daha az kaygı duymaktadır. Ayrıca öğrencilerin yabancı dil konuşma kaygılarıyla kişilik özellikleri ve yabancı dil konuşma öz-yeterlilikleri arasındaki anlamlı ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Yine yapılan incelemeler sonucunda bütün katılımcılar için yabancı dil konuşma öz-yeterliliğinin İngilizce konuşma kaygısını eksi yönde yordadığı bulunmuştur. Kişilik özellikleriyle ilgili olarak da Dışadönüklük her iki grupta da İngilizce konuşma kaygısını eksi yönde yordamıştır. En az İngilizce konuşma kaygısına sahip katılımcılar dışadönüklerdir. Ancak İngiliz Dili Eğitimi grubu için diğer bir eksi yönde yordayıcı Deneyime Açıklık iken, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı grubu için bu Sorumluluk olarak tespit edilmiştir. Ve bütün katılımcılar için İngilizce konuşma kaygısını artı yönde yordayan iki kişilik özelliği de Uyumluluk ve Duygusal Dengedir. Diğer bir deyişle İngilizce konuşma kaygı düzeyi en yüksek katılımcılar Duygusal Denge ve Uyumluluk özelliklerine sahip katılımcılardır. İngiliz Dili Eğitimi grubu için Sorumluluk ve İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı grubu için ise Deneyime Açıklık kişilik özellikleri anlamlı yordayıcı olarak tespit edilmemiştir. Ancak katılımcıların hepsi düşünüldüğünde beş kişilik özelliğinin beşi de bir şekilde İngilizce konuşma kaygısıyla ilgilidir ve onu anlamlı bir şekilde yordamaktadır. Çoğunluğun Uyumluluk kişilik özelliğine sahip olması ve Uyumluluk kişilik özelliğinin yabancı dil konuşma kaygısını pozitif pozitif yönde yordaması, ülkemizde neden insanların İngilizce konuşamadıklarına bir cevap olabilir. Bu çalışma yabancı dil öğrenenlerin konuşma kaygı düzeylerini düşürmek ve öz-yeterliliklerini yükseltmek için birtakım tavsiyeler sunmaktadır. Öğrencileri seviyelerine göre gruplamak için yapılan seviye tespit sınavlarının yanında kişilik testleri yaparak, öğrencilerin kişiliklerini de belirlemek ve öğrencileri kişiliklerine göre de gruplamak uygun olabilir. Buna ek olarak, yine yabancı dil öğrenenlerin konuşma kaygı düzeylerini düşürmek ve öz-yeterliliklerini yükseltmeye yönelik her kişilik özelliğine uygun program ve metotlar geliştirilmelidir. Yabancı dil sınıflarında ders veren dil öğretmenleri de öğrencilerin konuşma kaygı düzeylerini düşüren ve öz-yeterliliklerini yükselten faktörlerden haberdar olmalıdırlar; İngilizce öğretmeni, bir öğrencinin neden, ne zaman veya nerede konuşmadığı hakkında yargıya varırken öğrencinin düşük İngilizce seviyesi,

konuyu bilmemesi gibi etmenler yanında bu sessizliğin onun kişilik özelliklerinden kaynaklanabileceğini de hesaba katmalıdır. Yabancı dil öğrencileri de İngilizce konuşurken kendilerini kaygılı ve yetersiz gördüklerinde cesaretleri kırılmamalıdır, çünkü onların kişilikleri bu olumsuz duygulara sebebiyet veriyor olabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kişilik özellikleri, yabancı dilde konuşma, yabancı dil konuşma kaygısı, yabancı dil konuşma öz-yeterliği, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi.

Sayfa sayısı: 234

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Paşa Tefvik CEPHE



**THE RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY TRAITS WITH
ENGLISH SPEAKING ANXIETY AND
ENGLISH SPEAKING SELF-EFFICACY**

(Ph.D. Dissertation)

Haldun Vural

GAZI UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

February, 2017

ABSTRACT

It seems difficult for Turkish people to speak with foreigners maybe because they do not know them personally well enough and not feel comfortable with them. It is also believed that Turkish people are often lack of willingness to speak because they feel shy, anxious and not self-efficient enough in speaking. To start a conversation in a foreign language, there are two accepted obstacles; politeness and shyness. This fact is seen while students are learning English at universities as well. The lack of communicative competence of Turkish university students can be explained with this shyness, high speaking anxiety and insufficient self-efficacy. Speaking in front of people is challenging even in one's own language. Therefore, it can be asserted that personality and speaking anxiety and self-efficacy are interrelated. If teachers are aware of students' personality types and can find out whether the reasons for their anxiety are related to their personality traits, they may teach their classes better and decide on the most effective teaching techniques and methods. Although studies and investigations about speaking anxiety, personality traits and

speaking self-efficacy have been many in first language contexts (L1), the same cannot be asserted for the studies and investigations about speaking anxiety, personality traits and speaking self-efficacy in foreign language learning (EFL). Speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy can be suggested as the most common problems in foreign language learning. Since studies related to big five factors have shown that these factors can be changed through education or intervention and positively contribute to personality traits, it is necessary to determine which and how many of the big five personality traits factors match speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy. The aim of the current study is to determine the personality traits of 4th year students of English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature departments at Turkish universities; to examine whether there are significant differences between personality traits of ELT-ELL departments' students; to investigate whether there is a significant difference between foreign language speaking anxiety levels of ELT-ELL departments' students; to examine the relations among their English speaking anxiety, personality traits and English speaking self-efficacy; and to find out whether students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety. The study has the features of quantitative research design which has comparative and correlational characters in nature. Data are received from 4th year students of English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Departments by means of three questionnaires. 923 students of English Language Teaching Departments and 922 students of English Language and Literature Departments of 31 different universities in Turkey, totally 1845, participated in the study. The results of the current study show that the sequence of the personality traits is same for both English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature groups. The highest construct of personality traits for both groups is Agreeableness; whereas, the others are Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Neuroticism respectively. A significant difference between personality traits' scores of both groups is detected. The findings also show that there is a significant difference between the foreign language speaking anxiety levels of ELT and ELL students; ELT students are less anxious in speaking English than ELL students. Moreover, significant relations among foreign language speaking anxiety, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy of the participants are found out. Again, the findings indicate that foreign language speaking self-efficacy predicts foreign language speaking anxiety significantly and negatively. As for the personality traits, Extraversion significantly and negatively predicts foreign language speaking anxiety for both groups. This means that the extravert students have the least English speaking anxiety. Moreover, while the second negatively significant personality trait is Openness for ELT group, it is Conscientiousness for ELL group. And the two personality traits which predict foreign language speaking anxiety significantly and positively for both groups are Neuroticism and Agreeableness. This means that neurotic and agreeable participants have the highest foreign language speaking anxiety level. But, Conscientiousness for ELT group and Openness for ELL group are not significant predictors of foreign language speaking anxiety. However when all the participants are taken into consideration, all of the five personality traits are somehow related to English speaking anxiety and they predict it significantly. The majority of the participants have Agreeableness personality trait and Agreeableness predicts foreign language speaking anxiety positively; this may explain why people cannot speak English in our country. This study proposes some suggestions to lower speaking anxiety and to increase speaking self-efficacy of foreign language learners. In addition to the placement tests which group students according to their success, it can be better to separate students according to their personalities as well. Besides, programs and methods should be developed for each

personality trait in order to lower foreign language speaking anxiety of students and to increase their speaking self-efficacy. In EFL classrooms, educators should be careful about the factors that affect the level of speaking anxiety and self-efficacy of their students; when they decide on why and where their students are silent and do not speak in English, they should take the personalities of their students into consideration besides other factors such as low level of English. Therefore, EFL learners should not be discouraged when they feel anxious and less self-efficient about speaking English.

Key Words: Personality traits, foreign language speaking, foreign language speaking anxiety, foreign language speaking self-efficacy, English Language Teaching.

Page Number: 234

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZ	v
ABSTRACT	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS	xviii
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Purpose of the Study	4
1.4 Importance of the Study	6
1.5 Assumptions	7
1.6 Definitions	8
CHAPTER II	9
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
2.1 Background of Personality	9
2.1.1 Definition of Personality	9
2.1.2 Aspects of Personality	10

2.1.2.1 <i>Character</i>	11
2.1.2.2 <i>Temperament</i>	11
2.1.3 Factors Composing Personality	12
2.1.3.1 <i>Hereditary and Physical Factors of Personality</i>	13
2.1.3.2 <i>Environmental and Social Factors of Personality</i>	14
2.1.4 Personality Theories	16
2.1.4.1 <i>Psychoanalytic Personality Theories</i>	16
2.1.4.2 <i>Behavioristic Personality Theories</i>	17
2.1.4.3 <i>Humanistic Personality Theories</i>	17
2.1.4.4 <i>Trait and Factor Theories</i>	18
2.1.5 History of Personality Traits	21
2.1.5.1 <i>Brief Introduction to History of Personality Traits</i>	21
2.1.5.2 <i>First Investigations and ‘Humours’</i>	22
2.1.5.3 <i>Adjectives instead of ‘Humours’</i>	22
2.1.5.4 <i>First Instruments to Measure Personality</i>	23
2.1.5.5. <i>The History and Dimensions of the Big Five</i>	24
2.1.5.6 <i>Instruments Related to the Big Five</i>	28
2.1.5.7 <i>The Five Factor Model</i>	30
2.1.5.8 <i>Researches related to the Big Five</i>	31
2.1.5.9 <i>The Big Five in various Cultures and Languages</i>	32
2.1.5.10 <i>Assessment Flaws in the Big Five</i>	34
2.1.5.11 <i>The Big Five Studies out of Europe</i>	35
2.1.5.12 <i>Researches on Relations between Personality Traits and Other Factors</i> 39	
2.1.6 Personality Traits and Foreign Language Learning	44
2.1.6.1 <i>History of Personality Traits in Foreign Language Learning</i>	44
2.1.6.2 <i>Researches on Personality Traits in Foreign Language Learning</i>	46

2.1.6.3	<i>Researches on Personality Traits in FLL in Other Countries</i>	49
2.1.6.4	<i>Personality Traits and Self-Identities of Foreign Language Teachers</i>	50
2.1.7	The Big Five and Foreign Language Learning	51
2.2	Background of Speaking	55
2.2.1	Definition and Theory	55
2.2.2	Production and Speaking	58
2.2.3	Interaction and Speaking	59
2.2.4	Speaking and Communicative Competence	60
2.3	Background of Anxiety	61
2.3.1	The definition of anxiety	61
2.3.2	Types of Anxiety	63
2.3.3	Foreign Language Anxiety	67
2.3.3.1	<i>Anxiety and its Effects on Foreign Language Learning</i>	67
2.3.3.2	<i>Foreign Language Anxiety as a Negative Feeling</i>	68
2.3.3.3	<i>Foreign Language Anxiety Factors</i>	70
2.3.4	Test Anxiety	71
2.3.4.1	<i>Test Anxiety and Academic Success</i>	71
2.3.4.2	<i>Test Anxiety and Foreign Language Anxiety</i>	72
2.3.4.3	<i>Fear of Negative Evaluation</i>	73
2.3.5	Instruments to Measure Foreign Language Anxiety	74
2.3.6	Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety	76
2.3.6.1	<i>Communication Apprehension and Anxiety</i>	77
2.3.6.2	<i>Reasons of Communication Apprehension</i>	79
2.3.6.3	<i>Reasons of Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety</i>	79
2.3.6.4	<i>Reasons of FLSA Connected to Learners, Teachers or Instructional Practice</i>	82

2.3.7 Resolutions and Strategies for Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety.....	88
2.4 Background of Self-Efficacy.....	97
2.4.1 Definition of Self-Efficacy.....	97
2.4.2. Self-Efficacy and Social Learning Theory.....	97
2.4.3 Self-Efficacy and Outcome Expectations, Effort and Feedback.....	100
2.4.4 Self-Efficacy and Self-Esteem.....	101
2.4.5 Self-Efficacy and Positive-Negative Comments.....	102
2.4.6 Self-Efficacy and Vicarious Experience.....	102
2.4.7 Self-Efficacy and Mastery Experience.....	103
2.4.8 Dimensions of Self-Efficacy.....	103
2.4.9 Self-Efficacy and its Applications.....	104
2.4.10 Self-Efficacy and Education.....	105
2.4.11 Self-Efficacy and Foreign Language Learning and Speaking.....	106
CHAPTER III.....	111
METHODOLOGY.....	111
3.1 Model of the Study.....	111
3.2 The Sample.....	112
3.3 Data Collection.....	115
3.4 Data Analysis.....	120
CHAPTER IV.....	127
RESULTS and DISCUSSION.....	127
4.1 Results.....	127
4.2 Discussion.....	139
CHAPTER V.....	173
CONCLUSION.....	173
5.1 Pedagogical Implications.....	177

5.2 Limitations of the Study	180
5.3 Suggestions for Further Research	181
REFERENCES.....	183
APPENDICES	228



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 <i>Demographic Information for the Participants</i>	114
Table 2 <i>Reliability Statistics of Agreeableness</i>	117
Table 3 <i>Reliability Statistics of Openness</i>	117
Table 4 <i>Reliability Statistics of Conscientiousness</i>	117
Table 5 <i>Reliability Statistics of Extraversion</i>	117
Table 6 <i>Reliability Statistics of Neuroticism</i>	118
Table 7 <i>Reliability Statistics of FLCAS</i>	119
Table 8 <i>Reliability Statistics of FLSSE</i>	120
Table 9 <i>Tests of Normality of Data</i>	122
Table 10 <i>Descriptive Statistics of Personality Traits of ELT Department Participants</i>	128
Table 11 <i>Descriptive Statistics of Personality Traits of ELL Department Participants</i>	129
Table 12 <i>Personality Traits T-test results of ELT-ELL groups</i>	130
Table 13 <i>Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety T-test results of ELT-ELL groups</i>	132
Table 14 <i>Correlations between the scores of ELT foreign language speaking anxiety, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy</i>	133
Table 15 <i>Correlations between the scores of ELL foreign language speaking anxiety, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy</i>	134
Table 16 <i>Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis with Personality Traits and Foreign Language Speaking Self-Efficacy as Predictor of FLSA for ELT students</i>	136

Table 17 *Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis with Personality Traits and Foreign Language Speaking Self-Efficacy as Predictor of FLSA for ELL students*138



LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ELT	English Language Teaching
ELL	English Language and Literature
FLA	Foreign language anxiety
FLL	Foreign language learning
FLSA	Foreign language speaking anxiety
FLSSE	Foreign language speaking self-efficacy
PT	Personality trait

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, brief information about background of the study is provided. This information includes the summary of personality traits (PTs), speaking, foreign language speaking anxiety (FLSA) and foreign language speaking self-efficacy (FLSSE). The purpose and the significance of the study are also explained. In the end, definition of terms and limitations of the study are presented.

1.1 Background of the Study

To start a conversation in a foreign language there are two accepted obstacles; politeness and shyness. In literature about fluent conversations, politeness and shyness are among conflict-avoidance techniques (Ide, 1989) and strategies to keep friendly atmosphere and avoid disruptions (Leech, 1983). Shyness is also strictly correlated with high oral performance, and therefore, is among the communication confidence components (Park and Lee, 2005). It seems difficult for Turkish people to speak with foreigners maybe because they do not know them personally well enough and do not feel comfortable with them. It is also believed that Turkish people are often lack of willingness to speak because they feel shy, anxious and not self-efficient in speaking enough. In a study conducted in Turkey the participants rated themselves as medium talkative (Alishah, 2014).

This fact is obviously observed while students learn English at universities as well. The lack of communicative competence of Turkish university students can be explained with this shyness, high speaking anxiety and insufficient self-efficacy. Speaking in front of

people is challenging even in one's own language. Therefore, it can be asserted that personality and speaking anxiety and self-efficacy are interrelated.

In similar environments and groups, some people speak more in English than some others. Some prefer speaking freely and much, but some others abstain from speaking, depending on their anxiety and self-efficacy levels. This may be an interesting point because people with little English can talk more freely than people with high level of English. Therefore, it can be suggested that speaking English with other people does not always depend on knowledge level of speakers. It is obvious that the degrees of anxiety and self-efficacy in foreign language speaking affect the preferences of speakers as well. However, there are others factors that affect both these preferences and anxiety and self-efficacy of speakers; these factors are the personality traits of individuals.

Individual differences in personalities may affect the level of anxiety and self-efficacy in foreign language speaking of learners together with their level of English language. There are five dimensions of personality traits; Openness, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Agreeableness. Researchers in psychology agree that Extraversion and Neuroticism are closely related to each other (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985; McCrae and Costa, 1987) that other factors like Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness are closely related to affective factors like confidence and self-esteem and experience (Watson and Clark, 1992). In the history, it can be seen that personality traits have had some influence on learning a foreign language. Therefore, personality may be asserted as an important factor to understand the reasons of foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy because affect has important influence on speaking a foreign language.

MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) define foreign language anxiety as “the probability of experiencing anxiety arousal in a foreign language context, such as in a language classroom or when communicating in a foreign language”. Researchers suggest that the concept foreign language speaking anxiety has some importance in foreign language process, since speaking awakens more anxiety than other language skills and is negatively affected by anxiety.

Speaking in target language is the main objective of studying a foreign language for many foreign language learners (Hashimoto, 2002; MacDonald et al., 2003; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Hadziosmanovic, 2012). Therefore, speaking self-efficacy can be asserted to have an

important place in an efficient communication (Shumin, 1997; Tam, 1997; Brown, 2003; Zaremba, 2006; McCarthy and O'Keeffe, 2006; Songsiri, 2007; Khan and Zafar, 2010; Zhang, 2010). Speaking self-efficacy means how people assess their own speaking competence and capability. From this point of view, it can be suggested that FLSA and FLSSE are closely related for foreign language learners.

However, personality traits should not be neglected in determining the reasons for foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy either. There have been many studies about personality traits, speaking anxiety and self-efficacy in first languages; however, the same cannot be asserted for foreign language learning. In terms of foreign language learning, the effects of personality traits and self-efficacy on anxiety in speaking a foreign language still need to be investigated. Although there have been investigations about the relations between FLSA and personality traits in different contexts other than the current study, any investigations about the relations between FLSSE and personality traits has not been met. Therefore, it seems necessary to test the effects of personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy on foreign language speaking anxiety.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Although there are many investigations about speaking anxiety, speaking self-efficacy and personality traits in first language contexts, the same cannot be asserted for foreign language contexts. Anxiety and self-efficacy in speaking skill can be suggested as the most common problems in foreign language learning since speaking is accepted as the main purpose of learning a foreign language. Problems related to FLSA and FLSSE are also common in English language learning context in Turkey. Although Turkish students know good grammar and they may be successful in written exams, they generally cannot speak with the same ability (Çetinkaya, 2005). There have been studies investigating reasons as to why Turkish students can or cannot speak English. It seems important to investigate why some students do not speak English and feel anxiety while speaking in English although they have good proficiency in English. On the contrary, some students with poor knowledge of English try to speak and can communicate although they are not fluent. The factors related to the personality traits of learners may determine and affect the foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy of learners and so, influence their communication abilities and competence in English negatively or positively.

Since studies related to personality factors have shown that these factors can be changed through education or intervention and positively contribute to personality traits, it is necessary to determine which and how many of the personality traits match speaking anxiety and speaking self-efficacy. Not many studies have been conducted about relationships between personality traits and FLSA and even fewer studies have explored the relationships between personality traits and FLSSE. However, in Turkish context not any investigation regarding personality traits, foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy has been met. For that reason, it seems that there exists a need for an investigation to understand the influence of personality traits on FLSA and FLSSE in Turkey.

This study aims to examine the relationships between the personality traits, foreign language speaking anxiety and students' foreign language speaking self-efficacy, and how these personality traits and FLSSE predict students' FLSA and to find out the important personality factors that may affect students' FLSA. The differences in personality, the level of FLSA and FLSSE of the students and relations among these three factors and between English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Departments are taken into consideration.

Therefore, the factors related to personality traits, foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy, how these factors are measured with Turkish students and the relations between students' foreign language speaking anxiety, their personalities and their foreign language speaking self-efficacy are the subjects of this investigation.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

In Turkey, English learners cannot have direct exposure to English since everything in our country is in Turkish language. This can be asserted for Turkish universities and English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Departments as well. These students whose major is English have opportunities to speak and practice in English. These opportunities include some activities organized by the departments or universities, international students studying in Turkey whose native language is English and in-class activities. However, not all students benefit from these opportunities dynamically and try to speak English in all possible conditions. Some students feel less anxious and more self-efficient and participate in activities and speak English more than others although their English level is not so high; however, some students feel more anxiety and less self-efficacy in speaking English and do not participate in activities and speak English although

their English level is high. The reason why some students feel more or less anxiety and less or more self-efficacy regardless of their English level needs to be investigated. The factors affecting the levels of FLSA and FLSSE of the students apart from their level of language may be their personality traits. This may also explain why students with good results in English examinations and tests cannot speak English as well. They may not speak English because they do not feel proficient or their personality type hinders them.

There have been various studies and investigations on personality traits, anxiety and self-efficacy in L1 contexts, but for foreign language learning these kinds of studies are not many. Two important departments, English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature, which prepare English language teachers for Turkish students are chosen for the study because it is assumed that investigating afore-mentioned factors in university contexts will contribute to literature and provide data about how English as a foreign language learners' anxiety and self-efficacy are affected by their personality when they speak English. In other words, the correlations between personality traits and FLSA and FLSSE may help researchers and educators find ways and methods to increase self-efficacy in speaking a foreign language and decrease anxiety in speaking a foreign language of learners.

The degree and type of correlation between these three variables are investigated in this study. It also investigates the students' levels of FLSA, FLSSE and personality traits, and examines whether their personality traits and degree of anxiety in speaking a foreign language differ according to the departments of the students.

This study examines the correlations between factors of the personality traits, FLSA and FLSSE among 4th year students of English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Departments at Turkish universities; and aims to determine whether the personality traits and FLSSE are related to FLSA; whether they can contribute to FLSA, and if yes, how they can contribute to it.

In accordance with the above-mentioned objectives the following research questions are investigated:

1. What are the personal traits' scores of 4th year students of English Language Teaching (ELT) and English Language and Literature (ELL) departments?

2. Is there a significant difference between the mean scores of ELT and ELL students' personality traits?
3. Is there a significant difference between the means of foreign language speaking anxiety scores of ELT and ELL students?
4. Are there any significant relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy?
5. Are there any significant relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy?
6. Do ELT students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety?
7. Do ELL students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety?

1.4 Importance of the Study

In first language contexts speaking anxiety, personality traits, and self-efficacy have been investigated widely but the studies and investigations on personality traits, FLSA and FLSSE contexts are rare. In foreign language learning, foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy can be accepted as the most common problems in the world and in our country as well. Even in English classes, making students speak in English and participate in language activities can be accepted as one of the most challenging problems. High level of anxiety and low level of self-efficacy in speaking a foreign language can be suggested as dominant factor causing this unwillingness to speak and participate in language related activities. For that reason, the main focus in this study is on FLSA of the 4th year students of ELT and ELL departments in our country.

On the other hand, FLSA and FLSSE may not be enough to explain the reasons for lack of willingness to speak in English; so personality traits of the learners are the subject of this study as well because personality traits can be accepted as another factor determining the rate and success of students' foreign language speaking achievement. Therefore, it may be suggested that examining these two affective factors, anxiety and self-efficacy, in speaking

a foreign language and exploring the correlation between these two affective factors and personality traits may have very important contributions to the significance of the study.

It is also assumed that investigation of the correlation between anxiety and self-efficacy in speaking a foreign language and personality traits among ELT and ELL students at Turkish universities is theoretically important, since any study similar to the current study has not been met in Turkish university and country context; from this point of view, the current study is unique. This uniqueness is thought to contribute to the literature of personality traits, foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy and in our country. Therefore, this study may provide empirical evidence for further research studies in future.

Foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy, which may be suggested as two important and principal factors affecting the willingness to speak and their relations between personality traits are focus of attention in this study. Therefore, psychological needs of the learners are also emphasized and when determined, these psychological needs may lead better instruction of foreign language speaking as well.

After finding the correlation among the personality traits, foreign language speaking anxiety and foreign language speaking self-efficacy and then portraying the situation for our country, new suggestions will be made on programs and curricula and methods which can be more appropriate for English learners in Turkey. After further research for other groups of learners, the results can be expanded and applied to groups other than the participants of the current study.

Accordingly, investigation of personality traits, FLSA and FLSSE may help understand the reasons causing high speaking anxiety and low self-efficacy in speaking English in Turkey and proper solutions can be developed as well.

1.5 Assumptions

It is mainly assumed that:

- The participants of English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Departments are honest and sincerely answer the questions in all the applied questionnaires about personality traits, speaking anxiety and self-efficacy.
- The participants of English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Departments are honest and sincerely answer the questions in personality traits questionnaire.

- The participants of English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Departments are honest and sincerely answer the questions in foreign language speaking anxiety questionnaire.
- The participants of English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature Departments are honest and sincerely answer the questions in English foreign language self-efficacy questionnaire.

1.6 Definitions

Personality: Personality includes the psychological characteristics which make people different from each other and consists of qualities which form distinctive nature and temperament of individuals.

Personality traits: these are the factors to describe the interaction between people in their cultures and in social groups.

Anxiety: Anxiety is a disorder of feeling worry, nervousness, or unease and expecting an uncertain result.

Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety: According to Huang (2004) FLSA is related to the emotional reactions with which a person speaks a foreign language under fearful, nervous, uneasy or worrying situations.

Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy is a person's belief in his or her capability to successfully perform a particular task. A person's motivation, feelings, and behaviors are determined by her/his self-efficacy beliefs.

Foreign Language Speaking Self-Efficacy: This is one's assessing her/his own speaking ability and competence.

In this chapter first background of the study, statement of the problem and purpose of the study are outlined. Then importance of the study and assumptions are presented before definitions that are used in current study are clarified.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter related literature about personality traits, speaking skill, FLSA and FLSSE is given. After the definitions and history of personality traits are given, the definition, theory and characteristics of speaking together with anxiety and self-efficacy are mentioned and the place of foreign language speaking are introduced for each of personality, anxiety and self-efficacy concepts. The term ‘personality traits’ is presented together with its relations with speaking anxiety, and speaking self-efficacy in foreign language. The importance of an individual’s personality traits on her/his speaking anxiety, and speaking self-efficacy in foreign language is explained.

2.1 Background of Personality

In this part the definition of personality is given. After the personality is defined, the aspects of personality are discussed. And before the personality theories are discussed, factors composing personality are accounted.

2.1.1 Definition of Personality

Words may have many meanings except their denotations such as personality. Different personality investigators give different definitions to the word personality. Allport (1937) devoted a whole chapter of his book that is accepted as one of the first books in the history of personality field to define the word personality. In order to find out a word’s meaning one should look at its ways of usage, since one word may mean a lot of different things in different situations and may be used in many various ways (Wittgenstein, 1953). The word personality has been defined differently by different personality scientists in accordance

with their theoretical beliefs. All personality psychologists suggest that personality should be 'enduring' which means the consistency of personality characteristics across time and various situations, and 'distinctive' which means the psychological features differentiating a person from others; and these enduring and distinctive characteristics should 'contribute to' psychological factors which influence and partly explain a person's peculiar and enduring characteristics (Cervone and Pervin, 2008).

According to Cattell (1965), personality is defined as 'what a person will do in a given situation'. He also suggests that traits could be measured by verbal reports but behavior and real-world actions should also be taken into consideration and assessed as well (Cattell, 1973). However, personality measures based on behavioral tests have not been very successful and not validated widely. So, verbal report in trait assessment has been preferred by researchers. Stagner (1961) takes another point of view and describes the definitions of personality as stimulus, response and intervening variable. In another definition, personality is defined as a changing system of psychobiological systems which regulate the consistency of a person through experiences (Cloninger et al., 1993). From this definition, it can be inferred that this system can renew itself and goes on to develop and change. Personality concept expresses how behavioral patterns, interests, biologic and psychological structures and competencies of a person are integrated together (Akiskal and Hirschfeld, 1983). In other words, personality consists of a person's behaviors to provide a harmony in one's life and affective, mental and physical characteristics of an individual.

Thus, although there are many different definitions of personality according to different scholars, some concepts are common in each definition. Personality consists of characteristics that can be observed alike in different times and situations; that differ from person to person; and these characteristics should explain specific and lasting peculiarities of individuals.

2.1.2 Aspects of Personality

In this part, the aspects of personality are given. Personality has two facets; character on one hand and temperament on the other hand. Temperament, character and personality are three concepts that are used interchangeably but actually different from each other. Their similarities and differences are given below.

2.1.2.1 Character

Character is accepted to be related to the mental power of a person. Character of a person begins to develop from her/his childhood through punishment and reward, logical thinking, affective adoptions and imitating others under the effects of family, environment and school. Individual differences comprise the character. Cloninger asserted a psychobiologic theory to explain the personality, its structure and development (Cloninger 1987, Cloninger et al., 1993). Three dimensions of character exist in this model. These dimensions are self-transcendence, self-directedness and cooperativeness. Self-transcendence includes moral acceptance of the events, interpersonal identification of one's character and self-love. Cooperativeness includes kindness, being virtuous, social acceptance and empathy. Self-directedness includes having meaningful aims, developing confidence and skills to solve problems and accepting one's responsibilities about the choices one makes (Cloninger et al., 1993). So, character and an individual's mental power are closely related to each other and development of character starts from the childhood.

2.1.2.2 Temperament

Temperament can be defined as special, restricted and situation-based reactions of an individual's life. Instead of making general statements, now personality psychologists can identify specific types of influences. To pinpoint a definite quality of personality with a biological basis is a way to succeed this. These qualities can be forms of temperament. The term temperament is used for biological behavioral and emotional biases which are visible in early childhood (Strelau, 1998). Repressed and frightened behavior against new conditions like meeting strangers is a temperament characteristic (Fox et al., 2005).

According to the findings, functioning of brain systems involving response to fear is different in people and these biological varieties can result in psychological varieties while people experience inhibited or fearful behavior (Schmidt and Fox, 2002). Because development of brain is related with hereditary factors, personality psychologists try to understand connections among biological systems, genes and behavior. Developments in the field of molecular genetics have opened new paths to integrate for personality psychology. Instead of referring to general influence of genetic material or genome of an organism, special elements of genome that influence an individual's behavior are being investigated (Plomin and Caspi, 1999).

Cloninger et al. (1993) developed the psychobiologic theory and according to this theory, temperament has four dimensions; these are persistence, reward dependence, harm avoidance and novelty seeking. These dimensions are accepted as genetically independent from each other and assumed as stable to cultural and stationary effects. Persistence is accepted as hereditary tendency to continue to a special behavior. Reward dependence is accepted as hereditary tendency to continue to behaviors of oversensitivity. The third is harm avoidance which is accepted as hereditary tendency to restrain reasonable behaviors like sense of embarrassment, uncertainty and pessimistic concerns. And novelty seeking is accepted as hereditary tendency to start activity, making spontaneous decisions and awaiting rewards in return to a novelty (Cloninger, 1987). Therefore, temperament is another aspect of personality and is often considered innate and related to hereditary factors, biological systems, genes and behavior rather than learned.

In sum, character and temperament are two aspects of personality and character consists of the mental power of a person and it is related to the environment, outer world and distinctive ways individuals react, feels and sees. However, temperament is innate peculiarities of individuals coming from their genes.

Beside of these aspects, personality depends on some factors as well. These factors and how they affect personality are discussed below.

2.1.3 Factors Composing Personality

Personality has longitude characteristics. Therefore, it is not possible to explain personality with the behaviors observed at a given time in one's life because personality includes past, present and future in life of a person. So, it can be asserted that past impressions, present efforts and future hopes constitute the personality. An individual's personality is shaped through sophisticated processes that take long time. For this reason, it can be suggested that personality can be observed in one's actions, behaviors, habits and characteristics. However, personality can alter because of numerous factors. Environment and genetics can be given as examples of two crucial factors whose interactions shape human personality (Goldstein, 1981). Recently, it has been recognized that there are some interactions between environmental and heredity factors. And accordingly, it has been suggested that nature and nurture do not have different effects but they dynamically cooperate with each other. So, it can be asserted that genetic mechanisms can be activated through environmental experiences and as a result of this, some forms of experience can modify

organism's biology (Gottlieb, 1998). Thus, it was recognized by biologists and psychologists (Lewontin, 2000; Grigorenko, 2002; Ehrlich, 2000) that the word 'versus' was the problem between the traditional nature versus nurture and it should have been nature and nurture.

In short, personality is related to past, present and future, and an individual's personality is shaped in time. Environmental and heredity factors are equally important in shaping an individual's personality.

2.1.3.1 Hereditary and Physical Factors of Personality

Heredity is seen as the main factor to determine the personality, since heredity factors contribute strongly to individual and personal diversities (Rowe, 1999; Plomin and Caspi, 1999; Caspi; 2000). Because of the DNA structure in human beings, a person takes her/his parents' personality traits and characters. People's personalities are affected by their environment as well. However, the role of perception cannot be explained by environment in learning process since perception is connected to heredity. Personality is shaped through genetic characteristics transmission from parents to children. Not only colors of skin, eye and hair are determined by heredity, but also capacity, skills and aptitude of learning, type of intelligence are determined by it as well. Besides, it is heredity that defines how and to what extent people can improve their personality features.

Investigators have observed genetic impacts of these features on people at different ages ranging from puberty (Heiman et al., 2004) to teenage (Ando et al., 2004) and old age. A big element for personality and disposition in adults is seen in biometrical hereditary analyses. However, contrary to expectations, no signal of environmental effects on personality and character was observed (Ando et al., 2004; Gillespie et al., 2003). In personality researches, there is an excess dependence on adults, so from this point of view, discovery on environmental effects can be accepted as less confusing (Heiman et al., 2004). Every study on Cloninger's personality model in childhood has shown different results since the characters of children are still maturing. Not only hereditary factors, but also social factors influence to determine the personality because it is difficult to know which characteristics of a person are passed through by heritage.

Thus, hereditary factors determine not only the physical characteristics of a person such as eye and skin color etc. but their personality traits and characters as well. Beside hereditary

factors, social factors also play important role in determining the personality, especially in childhood because adults have already a mature personality.

2.1.3.2 Environmental and Social Factors of Personality

Besides the hereditary factors, environmental factors are also important for the improvement of personality. Even psychologists with biology background believe that environment has a critical role in people's personality development. People develop their self-concepts, values and objectives in their social environment. People become similar to or different from each other because of environmental factors (Cervone and Pervin, 2008). In personality development, family, peers, social class and culture are among important environmental factors. These factors are given below:

The first factor is culture. Every individual is a member of a culture, and there are approved and regularized behaviors, beliefs and customs in every culture. With these practices, people may know the nature of themselves, their roles in society and important principles and values in their lives. So, it can be asserted that personality characteristics may be shared by people belonging to the same culture. And people may not be aware of these cultural tendencies because nobody teaches them but they acquire these tendencies while they live in that culture. People live in a culture and this culture determines people's needs and the ways to remove them, reactions to some emotions, the ways to express themselves, their relations with others, in other words everything one can face in a culture (Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Fiske et al., 1998; Cross and Markus, 1999).

The second factor is social class. Social group of an individual is very important. Factors of social class regulate the roles, status, privileges and duties of individuals. These factors affect the ways people see themselves, see members of other social classes and how they behave in society. According to the researches, emotional and cognitive development of a person is affected by socioeconomic status. Social class factors determine how people behave in different situations together with their capacities and biases also like cultural factors (Bradley and Corwyn, 2002).

The third factor is family. The influence of the family on personality of an individual is accepted as one of the most important environmental factors (Park, 2004). Parents may have different patterns of behavior such as being rejecting and hostile or warm and loving, protecting and possessive or giving their children autonomy and freedom. Every one of these patterns affects a child's behavior. Besides, family practices do not always make

family members similar to each other. Family practices can also cause differences in a family such as the differences between male and female family members. Like gender, birth order may sometimes produce differences between family members. Firstborn children are sometimes profoundly preferred by parents (Keller and Zach, 2002) since firstborn children have more inclination to be more conscientious and accomplishment-oriented than their sisters and brothers (Paulhus et al., 1999).

The fourth factor is peer. Peer influences have been accepted as more significant to personality development than family practices (Harris, 1995). Accordingly, the reason why children from the same family may be so different from each other (Plomin and Daniels, 1987) might be explained with the fact that those children from the same family have various experiences outside their houses and what they practice at home does not make them rather identical (Harris, 1995). An individual is socialized through new rules of behavior in peer groups. These new experiences may influence the personality of an individual. So, children having low-quality friendships with a lot of conflict and quarrels may develop hostile, unpleasant behavior styles (Berndt, 2002).

As seen above, there are various factors affecting personality and socialization. Personality and socialization do not happen by themselves but instead, personality development is strongly connected with cultural and social system of society in which a person grows up. Among the environmental factors, family comes first. Family can be regarded as the most crucial and prominent factor in personality formation and the first social group of an individual. Children learn first social values in families, so family can be asserted as the first socialization model and origin (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2013). In families, children take their parents and other relatives, if there are, as model for some behaviors and social values. However, as a child grows up, the facts change and environmental variables affect children's personality more than their families. These environmental variables may be society, school, friends, teachers and the culture a person lives in (Narvaez et al., 2013).

In sum, personality is a complex term and has two factors such as environmental and social. Culture, social class, family and peer are the components of these factors. Personality does not realize by itself, so it needs cultural and social systems. Family is the first environmental factor and the other environmental factors can be school, teachers, peers and the society an individual lives. Personality and socialization are intertwined to each other and one cannot be thought separately from the other. Besides, personality

depends on many factors as well. After the discussion of aspects and factors of the personality, personality theories are given below.

2.1.4 Personality Theories

In this part the types of personality theories, their characteristics, their development in the history and their relations with each other are discussed. Some personality theories give importance to noticeable personality qualities rather than the ways of their emergence. According to McCrae and Costa (2003), personal variations that are expected to have consistent examples of actions, feelings and thoughts comprise characteristics. People are different from each other in many ways and because of these differences, it can be inferred that people learn a foreign language in different ways. There are four main personality theories; psychoanalytic, behavioristic, humanistic personality theories and trait and factor theories. And each theory discusses personality from a different point of view than others. Their connections with each other and deficiencies are also discussed. These theories are given as the followings:

2.1.4.1 Psychoanalytic Personality Theories

The first one is psychoanalytic personality theory which belongs to Sigmund Freud, Anna Freud and Erik Erikson who was an ego psychologist. Besides, Carl Jung represents the second theory which is called the transpersonal perspective which has more physical trace. Moreover, a social psychological view is the third one, which is represented by Erich Fromm, Alfred Adler and Karen Horney (Boeree, 2006). Personality psychodynamics and psychopathology can be defined through inner conflict point of view in a person's mental life. This emphasis on contradictory forces in the mind causes different ideas (Thomas and Segal, 2006).

The founder of psychoanalytic theory is Sigmund Freud. Psychoanalysis is a method to investigate human brain and also a way of treatment. Psychoanalysis has been used to understand normal and pathological human behaviors. It tries to give explanation to the psychopathological forms, to all aspects of human personality improvement and all kinds of human experiences (Thomas and Segal, 2006). Alfred Adler, Karen Horney and Carl Jung were accepted as neo-Freudians. They agreed that Freud gave extreme importance to sexuality in development of personality and little attention to sociocultural determinants of personality. They suggested that the origin of conflict was not sexuality but interpersonal relationships and sociocultural forces. They contradicted to Freud's biological stress on

instinctual drives (Thomas and Segal, 2006). In this theoretical pluralism age, there are two more theoretical approaches in addition to Freudian theory. They are object-relation theory of Kohut (1971) and self-psychology theory of Greenberg and Mitchell (1983). However, these theories have been lack of clearly testable predictions.

In sum, psychoanalytic personality theories depend on psychoanalysis which is seen as a method to search an individual's brain. However, this theory is criticized because it gives a great emphasis on sexuality.

2.1.4.2 Behavioristic Personality Theories

Behaviorist psychologists believe that same reactions in different situations do not imply that a need or trait causes this behavior. And they also believe that situation does not alone influence the behavior but a person's present position and his previous life may determine one's behavior (Thomas and Segal, 2006). Albert Bandura and Burrhus Frederic Skinner are two prominent psychologists of the behaviorism (Boeree, 2006).

In behaviorism, it is believed that a person responds stimuli, so if the stimuli are controlled, the person can also be controlled. In other words, people may behave unreasonably and at the end, they are punished because of their unreasonable behaviors. And because there is a pain after these behaviors, people think logically and quit their unreasonable behaviors pain (Kohn, 1999). Operant conditioning is the base of Skinner's entire system since he suggests that people operate in their environment. And through operating, people come across stimulus or in another name, reinforce. Operant is based on stimulus, so according to the consequences after certain behaviors people tend to repeat that action (Kohn, 1999).

Albert Bandura established the social learning theory. According to social learning theorists, consciousness is also important as behavior determinants; people are not submissive against their environment but they resist to those who want to control them. Individual's behaviors are determined by their expectations. In Bandura's social learning theory, a person learns by imitation, modeling and observation (Boeree, 2006).

Thus, behavioristic personality theories depend on stimuli and response. People learn through responding to the stimuli, then observing, modeling and imitating.

2.1.4.3 Humanistic Personality Theories

Humanistic psychology includes existential psychology. Contrary to behaviorist and psychoanalytic theories, experience or consciousness is believed to be important in

personality. Phenomenological methods are preferred by most humanist psychologists. Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow are the pioneers in humanistic method (Boeree, 2006).

Humanistic psychology began to appear in the first years of 1950s. The contributions of Abraham Maslow to humanistic psychology cannot be denied. He is accepted as one of the first positive psychologists. He supported the existentialism and suggested that the existentialism would cause a new psychology branch. In this new movement, the focus shifted from psychopathology of the individual to a genuine, self-actualized individual (Maslow, 1964). Maslow is well-known for his hierarchy of needs theory which has five levels; a) physiological needs, b) needs for safety and security, c) need for love and belonging, d) need for esteem, and e) need for self-actualization.

Carl Rogers (1959) is another humanistic psychologist and he is accepted as the most effective one in this field. Individual dignity and human potential to growth were given special importance by him in his theory of personality and so he gave extraordinary significance to authenticity, responsibility and freedom (Thomas and Segal, 2006). The characteristics of the 'I' or 'me' and the relationships of the 'I' or 'me' to other people and life constitute the 'self' in self-theory of Roger's (Rogers, 2007).

In sum, humanistic personality theories depend on humanistic psychology. In humanistic psychology individual, especially a genuine and self-actualized individual is emphasized. Dignity, responsibility, uniqueness and freedom of individual are among the factors of humanistic psychology.

2.1.4.4 Trait and Factor Theories

In every language there are plenty of terms depicting individuals. These terms are used to show differences in people's behavior. Personal style taxonomies have been depending on traits in the history.

The emergence of the personality traits idea backs to the first appearance of human language. In his book *Ethics* written in the 4th century BC, Aristotle (384-322 BC) defined attitudes such as cowardice, modesty and vanity as fundamental sources of any kind of behavior, whether moral or immoral; and he also defined the individual variations in these attitudes as excess, defect and intermediate levels. One of his students, Theophrastus (371-287 BC) took his teacher's work one step further and described 30 characters or personality types in his book. But instead of types, a translator suggested the word traits

(Rusten, 1993). He wanted to suggest that the traits of a person whether good or bad may be confined and separately investigated. However, personality traits have been approached scientifically in the twentieth century; emergence of new approaches to personality, discovery of new trait systems, new psychometric techniques, an agreement on smaller personality domains and new scientific ways to investigate personality occurred during this period. Psychometrics such as factor analysis and correlation has been used widely in statistical methods of personality scales. Correlation, multiple and confirmatory factor analyses are among the discoveries on traits in the twentieth century. In personality trait systems, there are broader traits which are termed as domains or dimensions. Among these, the five factor model including Neuroticism, Openness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness has been very influential (Matthews et al., 2009).

Since the lexicons of characteristics are found in all languages on the world, this approach is the most famous one (Dixon, 1977). A person's behavior, words, sentences and even nouns might have connotations of personality (Hofstede, 2007). Aristotle, in his book Ethics, suggests that attitudes develop through actions and as a result of these actions, personality is influenced.

In trait approach of personality theories, Eysenck and Eysenck were among the pioneers. They suggested three main personality characters. The most prominent of them were Extroversion, then Introversion and the third was Emotionality. The most crucial traits like Neuroticism and Extroversion may have relations with some major and vital quality of an individual and hereditary factors may influence this quality (McCrae et al., 2000; Eysenck, 1967). This traditional assumption is called inner locus of traits. There have been made various cognitive explanations for the trait Extroversion-Introversion and a different form of these personality traits has been emphasized from a different perspective (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1984). Beside of the Extroversion-Introversion and Neuroticism dimensions, later psychoticism dimension was added by Eysenck as well (Lewis et al., 2002). It is assumed that Extroversion means impulsiveness and sociality and so, extravert people are defined as communicative and social. Neuroticism means nervousness and emotional consistency and so, neurotic people are defined as more affective, tense, depressive, timid and uneasy with low self-confidence (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975).

It has also been found out that traits were in connection with definite behaviors and affection; for instance, Extroversion was in connection with uncontrolled affections,

impulsiveness, going out for fun, being social and having a lot of friends; psychoticism was in connection with insensible and antisocial behaviors, putting distance between oneself and others and aggression. Neuroticism was found to be in connection with illogical and affective behaviors and a bias towards low self-respect. It was also suggested by Eysenck that these peculiar personal characteristics were separate dimensions as well (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975).

Also Cattell and Kline (1977) divided traits into two groups such as surface traits which referred to apparent responses and source traits which referred to properties affecting behavior. Traits are accepted as constructions not having independent causal status. So, different researchers have approached traits in different ways. For example, it is argued that natural classes of acts are described by traits (Buss and Craik, 1983). It is also suggested that circumstantial presentations of behavior and situation are the traits (Wright and Mischel, 1987). Moreover, people may construct special traits in their communication according to the situation (Hampson, 1988). Therefore, it can be deduced that a general scientific traits theory does not exist since some theorists focus on the dimensional measurement and structure of traits, and some others prefer studying basic nature of traits (Goldberg, 1993).

To sum up, as discussed above, there are four personality theories; psychoanalytic personality theories deal with human brain, and uses psychoanalysis as a way of treatment. But it is criticized since it gives excessive emphasis on instinctual drives and sexuality. Behavioristic personality theories depend on stimuli and response and there is an emphasis that people learn through living and responding to the stimuli in society. The third personality theory discussed above is humanistic personality theory. Here, humanistic psychology is prominent and the main focus and emphasis in humanistic psychology is individual. And the last theory is trait and factor theory; during the history, investigators have tried to describe individuals using some terms. In trait and factor theory, two factors have been given importance; the first is the dimensional measurement and structure of traits and the second is the basic nature of traits.

After the discussion of trait theories of personality, history of personality traits is given in the next part.

2.1.5 History of Personality Traits

In this part, a brief information about the history of personality traits and their development and change during the history and the last tendencies in personality traits studies are given before the history of foreign language learning and personality traits relations.

2.1.5.1 Brief Introduction to History of Personality Traits

Some personality theories and theorists are discussed above. Personality theorists have suggested many theoretical structures to describe the personality. These theories have been developed from various sources and so, sometimes they have been in harmony, but sometimes contradicting with each other. The adjectives describing the characteristics of personality do not include all the aspects of personality, but still they can give a perspective to understand the personality in a large frame. The basic understanding in personality investigations is the hypothesis that individual differences of people are encoded in all world languages and reflected as words concretely and the studies to build a classification of personality to prove this hypothesis (Somer, 1998). In scientific studies of traits, it has been determined that the individuals use trait descriptors in their natural languages and individuals can be clustered together according to the similarities in their inclinations, so there are generalizations in personality. There may be various ways to handle the history of traits such as finding out the equivalents of Extraversion and Neuroticism in different periods (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1969; Eysenck, 1981) and studying the transformation of currently prevailing five factor personality model (Goldberg, 1993).

Personality traits have been investigated for a long time. Investigations on personality have given a lot of information on origins, structures, consequences and nature of personality traits (Buss, 1989). This information can be used to explain a person's choice of character, because one's character is connected to one's behaviors and as a result of this, one's character may prevail many clues about a person's behaviors. Actually, traits were thought pure cognitive fictions by many psychologists. For the last twenty-five years, experimental researches have formulated the structure, consequences, nature and origins of personality traits. Nowadays, traits are assumed to explain most part of human behavior (McCrae and Costa, 2003).

2.1.5.2 First Investigations and ‘Humours’

However, the first personality classifications did not depend on words but the body fluids. The history of traits starts with classical thinking. Except from Aristotle and Theophrastus, Hippocrates (460-377 BC) and Galen from Pergamum (130-200 AD) can be assumed as the earliest ancestors of modern trait theories (Stelmack and Stalikas, 1991). Hippocrates suggested the theory of body fluids or humours which were yellow bile, black bile, phlegm and blood. Later, a Greek physician Galen defined the humours as grounds of temperament. He called these terms as sanguine (confident and optimistic), phlegmatic (impassively calm), choleric (angry) and melancholic (having low mood) and these terms are still being used in modern English. The significance of these humoral terms lasted till the Middle Ages. Immanuel Kant and Wilhelm Wundt also mentioned about humoral temperaments in their works (Matthews et al., 2009). Scientific research about trait could be started after methodical data gathering, statistical procedures for data analysis and improvement in testable solutions were commenced. These preconditions came out at the beginning of the 20th century. Factor analysis and correlation were two essential new techniques (Kline, 1994). Factor analysis was an objective method to lower big numbers of trait terms into convenient number of broad dimensions.

2.1.5.3 Adjectives instead of ‘Humours’

With scientific development, personality traits turned to word, i.e. adjectives, again from ancient humours. Personality traits are significant factors to describe the interaction between people in their cultures and in social groups. First investigations on finding out personality traits through language go back to late 1880s. At the very beginning, it was a dictionary used as a source of material by some researchers. Sir Francis Galton (1884) had some adjective studies and he tried to prove that distinctions of personalities among people were encoded in all languages through adjectives (1884). He hypothesized that natural language terms could reflect personal differences in personality of an individual. Galton (1884) chose approximately 1000 adjectives which had somewhat different meanings. Among these adjectives, he determined some adjectives with same meanings and are common to give information about human character. De Raad (2000) called this lexical hypothesis.

In mid 1930s with Thurstone the first traces of the five-factor model appeared. Thurstone was one of the first users of factor analysis development and he introduced multiple factor

analysis. Then factor analysis has been used systematically in personality researches. Thurstone determined 60 most-used adjectives. Then in his investigation with people, the participants were asked to underline the adjectives they used while speaking with their close friends (Thurstone, 1934). The data were analyzed through factor analysis and five factors which were free from each other were obtained. However, instead of using his new discovery, Thurstone chose to develop Thurstone Temperamental Schedule. Surprisingly he did not call these 'five factors' (Digman, 1996).

Thurstone was not alone to use adjective in his personality traits studies. According to Allport and Odbert, personality characteristics which are most socially relevant and salient in people's lives are encoded in their language and expressed in single words. After examining English language dictionaries, Allport and Odbert extracted 18,000 adjectives which were describing personality in 1936; then they categorized them under four groups. They suggested that these 18,000 adjectives depicted the traits which were relatively permanent and observable. Then, Allport (1937, 1961) defined some trait types such as motivational traits, stylistic traits, secondary traits, central traits, a cardinal trait, individual traits and common traits. Gordon Allport (1937) was one of the first trait psychologists and he suggested that traits were organized by mental structures and these structures were different from individual to individual and the behavior was initiated and guided by these structures. Also Carr and Kingsbury (1938) suggested the anticipating nature of traits; an individual's behavior could be predicted from his personal traits. But they also indicated that traits could only be deduced from people's behavior and they could not be observed directly. This view is still shared by some trait theorists such as McCrae et al. (2000).

2.1.5.4 First Instruments to Measure Personality

Allport used trait concepts eagerly and as a result of this, investigators began to develop scales to measure these traits. The first instrument was Woodworth's Personal Data Sheet in 1917. Many tests and instruments have been developed since 1917 and some of them can be found in psychological testing books (Cronbach, 1990). The California Personality Inventory (CPI) and The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) are famous trait-based instruments in late 1930s. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) developed by Hathaway and McKinley and it was used to measure nine psychiatric syndromes and was the first empirically keyed personality questionnaire.

Many psychologists believed that the five factors are very few to determine the personality. Raymond B. Cattell is one of these psychologists and a trait theorist (1943). He indicates that the term 'traits' has broad dimensions which contains narrower traits. These narrower traits interact with each other and so, an individual may have tendencies towards more than one trait. These narrower traits have been called primary traits by Cattell. Cattell chose 4500 adjectives from the list of Allport and Odbert and instead of the five factors, Cattell used thirty five variables and found out twelve independent factors through factor analysis. But although they used orthogonal rotational methods, some other researchers could not duplicate more than five of these factors (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1990). And at the end, his 16PF (16 Personality Factors) Personality Questionnaire appeared out of these twelve independent factors (Goldberg, 1993). Another classification was developed in 1967 by Norman. In this classification, there were seven content categories such as social roles, stable, social effects, temporary states, biophysical traits, activities, anatomical-physical and evaluative terms (John and Srivastava, 1999).

After Cattell's and Thurstone's initiating researches that used factor analysis, the interest in personality traits increased. This interest resulted in various personality trait instruments such as MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) (1939), Y/GPI (Yawate-Guilford Personality Inventory) (1953), NPRS (Norman Peer Rating Scales) (Norman, 1963), EPQ (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975) (Eysenck Personality Questionnaire) and HPI (Hogan, 1986) (Hogan Personality Inventory). Personality traits were attempted to be confirmed but this could not be realized because there was no unity on personality traits researches since factors obtained from different questionnaires and investigations could not be replicated. Yet a consolidation movement started for numerous personality inventories in early 1980s.

As seen above, before the agreement on five dimensions of personality and the Big Five, there were various personality inventories. Thus, it can be suggested that the Big Five may be a consensus for all these different types of personality inventories.

2.1.5.5. The History and Dimensions of the Big Five

Five dimensions of personality first occurred in 1960s and the investigations on the Big Five became intense during 1980s and 1990s. At the end of the 1980s, personality psychologists agreed upon five powerful factors of the Big Five which could provide a practical and significant classification (Taggar et al., 1999; Burger, 2006). It was

consolidated by many researches that five factors could comprise the most common characteristics of personality. This five-dimension approach was termed as the Big Five (Friedman and Schustack, 1999). The Big Five is accepted as a comprehensive personality traits model and according to Big Five personality traits, individual differences among normal people can be organized as five orthogonal or independent dimensions; these are Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness. Individual differences of people's characteristic models of behavior, emotionality and thought are reflected in these dimensions; they consist of clustered parts of an individual and through self- or other-reports they can be judged (Digman, 1990; Costa and McCrae, 1992; McCrae and Costa, 1997; Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham, 2005). These five dimensions are as the following:

The first dimension is Extroversion. This dimension is similar to Eysenck's Extroversion/Introversion dimension. Characteristics of this dimension are generally sociable, outgoing, talkative, active, easygoing and lively. Two important components of this dimension are ambition/passion and friendliness (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Extrovert people are active, outgoing and carefree, and they have more tendencies to self-disclosure (McCrae and Costa, 1985; Aktaş, 2006). Superiority and wish for prizewinning are among the motivational factors for extrovert people (Barrick et al., 2002). Under stress, they tend to use problem oriented coping strategies (O'Brein and DeLongis, 1996). On the other hand, introvert people tend to be shy, timid, peaceful, calm and quiet (Friedman and Schustack, 1999).

The second dimension is Agreeableness which requires humanistic dimension of humanity (Digman, 1990). This dimension is considered together with kindness, politeness, trustfulness, open to cooperation and forgive others, tender-mindedness, compliance and tolerance (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Agreeableness is also the ability to agree with other individuals and build pleasing and satisfying relations with people (Dede, 2009). Tender-minded people are friendly, cooperative, trustful and intimate, modest, supportive, tolerant and affective towards others (McCrae and John, 1992). They give importance to compromise rather than competition (Barrick et al., 2002). They avoid conflicts among people and when they have to, they do not apply and use power to solve this conflict (Cloninger, 2000). People on the other polar of this dimension are aggressive, rude and

cold (Friedman and Schustack, 1999). They are indifferent, jealous and hostile towards others, egocentric and also vengeful (Digman, 1990).

The third dimension is Conscientiousness which is also called as 'wish to succeed' since it is related to educational success measurements. This dimension is considered as dutifulness, achievement striving, deliberation, self-discipline, competence and order (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Conscientious people are disciplined, ready to cope with problems, faithful to ethical principles and values, and they are capable of fulfillment of a duty and pondering enough before acting (Neuman and Wright, 1999; Mete, 2006). Impulsive people on the other polar of this dimension are reckless, disorganized, untidy and far from controlling themselves (Friedman and Schustack, 1999).

The fourth dimension is Neuroticism (Emotional Stability). Emotional balance dimension is often termed as emotional stability, emotionalism or neuroticism. Its common characteristics are assumed as vulnerability, self-consciousness, depression, impulsiveness, angry hostility and anxiety (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Neurotic people tend to live negative emotions for long times and develop some behavior pathologies. They have difficulties to build and sustain healthy relations with people and they live longtime stress (Bruck and Allen, 2003). They use emotional centered coping skills to overcome stress (O'Brein and DeLongis, 1996). Neurotic people are very angry, tense, anxious, depressive and worried. Besides, these people may have more conflicts in their families and jobs and so, they may experience more stress (Mete, 2006). They may choose one of the ways of turning their stress into success or becoming reckless due to their anxiety. However, Neuroticism may not be a serious antisocial behavior disorder and it does not interfere with the ability to evaluate the reality, but it is a kind of psychological disorder caused by psycho-social stress factors (Güleç, 2006). Both types of personalities can be seen. On the other hand, emotional stable people are calm and self-complacent (Friedman and Schustack, 1999), peaceful and have high self-confident and tend to live positive emotions (McCrae and John, 1992).

The fifth dimension is Openness to Experience. This dimension is accepted as the most difficult to explain. It is often termed as intelligence, but generally called as Openness to Experience, Openness or Culture. This dimension is thought to be related with the characteristics of fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas, values, open-minded, cultured, curios for knowledge and to learn (Barrick and Mount, 1991). People with

Openness to Experience trait are tolerant about the rules, reject traditional gender roles, approach exams with humorous point of view and like to experience new things. They take initiative and do not accept the rules to be performed without questioning. They emphasize independence and uniqueness when they describe themselves. They are brave; they have insight and prefer diversity to monotype (McCrae and Costa, 1985). People who are open to experience generally seem to have big imagination, humorous and be original. They may be artists or writers. People with low Openness to Experience in this dimension are shallow, plain and simple (Friedman and Schustack, 1999) and they have very traditional attitudes in their relations with other people; they are normative, obedient to authority, have less imagination and do not like diversity (McCrae and Costa, 1985).

After describing five dimensions of the Big Five, the further information about the Big Five and its history can be given as the following.

In order to define the broad factor, Goldberg analyzed the current adjective lists in 1981. According to the results of factor analysis, the Big Five was represented by the first five factors and various factor extraction and rotation methods were repeated. Also it was indicated that personality at the broadest sense was represented by these five dimensions and numerous personality characteristics could be found in each of the five dimensions (John and Srivastava, 1999). Actually, Goldberg was familiar with this model of Eysenck PEN (Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism) before (Peabody and Goldberg, 1989). But according to Goldberg, the five factor model was “robust” and these big five dimensions were to be included in each structural model on personal differences (Goldberg, 1981). Thus, the first researcher who used the term “Big Five” for the five-factor lexical model was Goldberg. He later developed Big Five “factor markers”. He ultimately had 50 items and then 100 items scales (Goldberg, 1992; Goldberg, 1993).

Basic dimensions of personality are represented by this five-factor. And these factors depend on four important bases: 1. Longitudinal and inter-research studies indicated the five factors and these factors revealed behavioral stereotypes; 2. All traits of each factor were found in personality system and language of the society where the investigation was conducted; 3. These five factors were determined in different age, race, gender and language groups, but at the same time they can be expressed in different ways in various cultures; 4. The evidence of generic inheritance has been debated (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Five Factor Personality model occurred from factor analysis of various personality

tests and scales and a detailed analysis of the adjectives was used to describe the personality (Friedman and Schustack, 1999). As a hierarchic organization model of personality traits, Five Factor Personality model has five sub-dimensions; Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness (McCrae and John, 1992).

2.1.5.6 Instruments Related to the Big Five

Many different instruments were used to conduct the researches in the Big Five and these instruments were different from each other on the ways they conceptualized the Big Five. There was a great interest in Big Five and this interest increased the need to develop different instruments to measure the Big Five (Worrell and Cross, 2004). These different instruments could be divided into three groups as the first group of instruments that used single adjectives for the measurement of the Big Five (e.g. TDA, 'Trait Descriptive Adjectives', Goldberg, 1992); the second group of instruments that used sentence format for the measurement of the Big Five (e.g. NEO-PI-R, 'Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness Personality Inventory-Revised', Costa and McCrae, 1992); and the third group of instruments that used short phrases for the measurement of the Big Five (e.g., BFI, 'Big Five Inventory', John et al., 1991).

According to the investigations, the NEO (Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness) questionnaires (NEO-PI-R, 'Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness Personality Inventory-Revised', NEO-FFI, 'Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness Five Factor Inventory') can be asserted as the best validated big five measures while TDA (Trait Descriptive Adjectives) consisting single adjectives can be asserted as the most commonly used measurement. And Big Five Inventory is used in studies when the time is limited. It was also asserted that short phrase items format of Big Five Inventory (BFI) provided more context than single adjective items format like Trait Descriptive Adjectives (TDA) and this caused more clarity and less complexity than sentence items format used in Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness (NEO) questionnaires (John and Srivastava, 1999). According to the comparison of these three most popular measures by John and Srivastava (1999), TDA scales had alphas with a mean of .89, then by the BFI .83 and then NEO-FFI .79. Neuroticism, Conscientiousness and Extraversion were determined as the most reliable subscales while Openness and Agreeableness were found as the least reliable subscales. When the convergent validity was taken into account, the strongest convergence was found in Trait Descriptive Adjectives (TDA) and Big Five Inventory (BFI). Conscientiousness,

Agreeableness and Extraversion showed the highest convergence among the instruments (John and Sirivastava, 1999). There were low discriminant correlations. These entire factors showed that the Big Five had independent dimensions and those independent dimensions could be measured with discriminant and convergent validity.

Costa and McCrae's (1992a) questionnaire-based research can be asserted as another important development in the Big Five literature. This research was different from lexically-based research. Costa and McCrae independently developed two NEO instruments which were NEO-PI-R and NEO-FFI and these were in sentence-format. The one called NEO-PI-R was a three factors personality inventory model including Openness to Experience, Extraversion and Neuroticism (Costa and McCrae, 1985). Later, in order to have consensus with emerging five factors, they added more items and made an updated NEO-PI which had 240 items (McCrae and Costa, 1985). Then, they made a different version with 60 items which they called NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) (Costa and McCrae, 1992a). But the most debate happened at lower order levels. As an example, Costa and McCrae were criticized because their placement and selection of particular facets involved some subjective decisions. The analysis at the facet level was expected to be a wider description, but predictive utility of the facets was more limited than the Big Five (Reynolds and Clark, 2001). NEO-PI-3 (Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness Five-Factor Inventory-3) has been introduced recently by McCrae and Costa (2007). NEO-PI-3 is approximately same with NEO-PI-R, except having some new simpler vocabulary.

In Turkish language there are two scales to evaluate the personalities of non-pathological individuals; these are NEO-PI-R developed by Costa and McCrae (1987) and adapted to Turkish (Gülgöz, 2002), and the Big Five Personality Inventory (5FKE) developed by Somer et al. (2002). The studies conducted on adjectives in dictionary describing personalities in Turkish have supported the Big Five Model (Somer and Goldberg, 1999). Many personality traits can exist in individuals but the Big Five Model consists of a good categorization (Yurtsever, 2009). There is also Maudsley Personality inventory that was developed by Eysenck especially to measure extroversion and introversion traits in individuals. In his investigation Topçu (1976) provided the validity and reliability of this inventory and Sarıçoban (1994) used it in his PhD dissertation.

In sum, there was a great variety in personality inventories before the Five Factor Model was introduced and accepted with great consensus by the investigators. As it can be seen

above, each inventory was criticized because of some flaws or deficiency in it. As for the inventories discussed above, it seems each inventory had pros and cons in comparison to other inventories. But, it can also be inferred that all these inventories showed the need for a comprising and less criticized inventory. So, the Five Factor Model became an effective and dynamic inventory.

2.1.5.7 The Five Factor Model

The Five Factor Model can be asserted as one of the latest personality models and among the most efficient and useful models in the field of personality. By this model, it is stated that personality can be characterized by five clustered trait descriptors. These five basic personality traits are Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness, Extraversion and Neuroticism (Wolfgang, 2005).

Each of these five factors can be described with various names. According to John and Srivastava (1999), Extraversion is described as sociable, active, assertive and positive emotional approach to material and social world; Agreeableness is described as altruist, tender minded, trustful and modest traits causing cooperative direction to other people with antipathy; Conscientiousness is described as socially control of oneself which promote target and duty directed attitude; Neuroticism is described as negative emotions like nervous, tense, sad and anxious in contrast to emotional stability, calmness and even-temperedness; and Openness is described as the broadness, intensity, ingenuity and complexity of one's mental and factual life. John and Srivastava (1999) also asserted that five factor model established a taxonomy which brought order to hitherto disordered field of personality research. The Big Five model is obtained from natural language terms that people use when they describe themselves and others, so it does not have a precise theoretical aspect (John and Srivastava, 1999).

Thus, investigators began to use Big Five and Five-Factor Model (FFM) terms correspondently in their personality traits studies and investigations. The Big Five term was regarded as a taxonomy or template for personality trait investigators (John and Srivastava, 1999; De Raad and Perugini, 2002; De Fruyt et al., 2004). It has become a model since its structure comprises much of personality psychology (De Raad and Perugini, 2002). Later, personality trait researchers produced and used their own instruments but in order to validate the results and their findings they correlated their instruments with Costa and McCrae's NEO-PI-R (Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness

Personality Inventory-Revised) or Goldberg's Factor Markers questionnaire or both of them (Gow et al., 2005).

Although these two instruments, both developed to measure personality traits, seem to agree with each other, each instrument may measure the factors differently. Both instruments name the terms as Factor 1-2-3-4-5, but only Factors 1, 3, and 4 have always been the same in researches for twenty years. 1. Factor, Surgency became Extraversion. 2. Factor which is about an individual's relations with and perceptions about other people is Agreeableness, Socialization and Friendliness. 3. Factor, Will to Achieve, became Conscientiousness. And 4. Factor is named as Neuroticism in Five-Factor Model (FFM) and Emotional Stability in the Big Five. Here it can be asserted that many negative items in this factor and personality problems of people according to the previous researches are reflected in Neuroticism (Digman, 1990). And Factor 5, Openness to New Experiences, is somehow problematic and many researchers suggest that it may change according to the culture and language of the people in investigations. Factor 5 was Culture at the beginning (Goldberg, 1993; Norman, 1963). Some researchers argued that Factor 5 should be divided into two factors according to linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the participants. And some studies in East Asia mentioned about six-seven factor models depending on the language differences.

Thus, the Big Five was being translated into different languages and investigators began to use it for their studies in different cultures and languages. So, the Big Five was on its way to be a universal inventory.

2.1.5.8 Researches related to the Big Five

There happened an increase in researches related to Big Five personality traits and almost a consensus was achieved by researchers from the beginning of 1990s. Cross cultural validity of the Big Five was tested at the very end of 20th century. After reviewing the Big Five instrument in different languages, Saucier, Hampton, and Goldberg (2000) reported well adaptation of the instrument into Russian and German (i.e. Indo-European languages), Filipino, and Hebrew (Non-Indo-European languages). Also, cross cultural researches about the Big Five in some Western and non-Western countries support the existence of the Big Five in those cultures as well. The studies to support the validity of the Big Five have been in such languages as Czech (John and Srivastava, 1999), Chinese (Yang and Bond, 1990), Japanese (Pulver et al., 1995), Norwegian, Hebrew (Almagor et al., 1995),

Finnish, Estonian, and German (Pulver et al., 1995), Turkish (Somer and Goldberg, 1999), Russian (John and Srivastava, 1999) Dutch (Fruyt et al., 2000; Hendriks et al., 1999), and Flemish, Italian (Pulver et al., 1995). The researches in different cultures and languages can be seen as evidences to show both culturally-specific dimensions of personality traits and the existence of universal aspects of them.

Then, the scope of usage of the Big Five was extended. According to the external validity studies of the Big Five, it can be suggested that some outcomes like academic performance, childhood psychopathology, job performance and physical health were predicted by the Big Five traits (John and Srivastava, 1999). A lot of outcome measures of positive and negative psychology were also used to investigate the Big Five. King et al. (1996) can be given as an example for this kind of investigation. They studied the corporation between the Big Five and verb formation ability and formative capabilities. According to the findings, it was asserted that Agreeableness was negatively correlated with formative capabilities while formation ability was positively correlated with Extraversion and Openness. In an investigation of Rubinstein (2005) on gender differences in the Big Five, he found out that women's Agreeableness and Conscientiousness scores were greater than men's. It was also determined in this study that the students from law school were less open to experience and less agreeable than the students of all other schools and they were more neurotic than natural science students. In another study, Friday (2005) found out in his dissertation that the Big Five was directly related with GPAs of the students at all grade levels. He did not indicate any gender difference between GPA and personality in correlations. In their study, Marlar and Joubert (2002) found out that Extraversion and Conscientiousness were positively correlated with self-esteem, while Neuroticism was negatively correlated with it. According to some other researches on scales of different personality questionnaires, two big dimensions of Neuroticism and Extraversion were supported (John and Srivastava, 1999). As a result, it can be asserted that the Big Five traits exist and they are associated with positive and negative psychological outcomes.

2.1.5.9 The Big Five in various Cultures and Languages

As a result of the recent consent on five-factor model of personality traits, it was claimed by McCrae that the same trait structures are found in a lot of different cultures and languages, and there is a relation between ages and personalities of the participants and this

leads new ways of approaches to culture and personality (McCrae, 2000). From this information, it may be inferred that instead of a universal personality traits, researchers should focus on whether or how and to what extent the Big Five personality traits are influenced by culture in local settings. But the existence of five personality traits which are shared by whole humanity is still disputed, since the models before the Big Five are still used and also new personality traits models have occurred especially in Asian countries.

The Big Five became an important model in general psychology in 1990s and has become a leading personality trait model. Different empirical studies supported positively the big five personality traits. But 3-factor Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism (PEN, the Big Three) model occurred out of the debate between Costa and McCrae who favored the Big Five and Eysenck (Costa and McCrae, 1992; Eysenck, 1992). Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) is used to measure PEN model (Psychoticism, 'P' also known as tough-mindedness; Extraversion, 'E', and Neuroticism 'N' also known as emotionality). And at the beginning, it was suggested as mainly a nervous explanation of personality (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). Later on Eysenck replaced the term nervous with the term genetic factors. This last version consisted of physical tolerance of human body to external stimuli (Eysenck, 2000). Eysenck showed negative opinion against the Big Five and criticized it because he asserted that the Big Five was not scientifically approached in clinical psychology to be theorized, developed as a model and then tested. But instead, he suggested that the Big Five was just a description of behaviors (Eysenck, 1991). Some researchers investigated relationships between the Big Five Traits. One of them was Rubinstein. He found out that Agreeableness was correlated positively with Conscientiousness and Openness but Neuroticism was negatively correlated with both Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Rubinstein, 2005).

Researchers used the PEN model especially in cultures where English was not native language and when the Big Five lacked some factors. As an example, the Italy case can be given; because of the cultural differences, researchers suggested that only three factors of the Big Five existed (Di Blas and Forzi, 1999). It is a fact that Dutch and German are lexically related to English but still it has been difficult for researchers to replicate all of the Big Five and because of this, they proposed to use the Big Three again (Peabody and De Raad, 2002).

In sum, it is a challenging problem to translate and transfer the Big Five between languages and cultures. Researchers preferred the adaptation of the Big Five when they face such problems in order to have the most efficient results. In addition, sometimes it is not possible completely to use Big Five, researchers reduced these five factors even to three factors.

2.1.5.10 Assessment Flaws in the Big Five

It is possible to assess humans' personality (Chamot, 2004; Bartlett and Elliott, 2008). But there may be some flaws in the assessments; as tools for assessment belong particular cultures, different contexts may yield different results and it is not possible to generalize the constructs thorough different cultures (Ben Porath, 1990) because of the loses in translations (Perera and Eysenck, 1984). Yet, the cross-cultural validity of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) is well-established since it has been translated into plenty of different languages (Eysenck and Barrett, 2013; Van Hemert et al., 2002).

Indeed, all five factors of the Big Five cannot be translated into non-English language contexts. Out of them, the most difficult one to translate is the Factor 5 which is termed as Intellect-Imagination or Openness to New Experiences. After Factor 5, Factor 1 – Extraversion and Factor 2 – Agreeableness are assumed difficult to analyze as different, unrelated factor too. In order to solve this problem, alternative fifth factors and sometimes six/seven-factor models have been proposed. Humility or Honesty is an agreed alternative fifth factor that was discovered in personality trait studies in non-Germanic languages. For example, it was founded by Ortiz et al. (2007) that four of the Big Five were supported by a Mexican personality traits inventory in Mexico. The results of this Mexican study overlapped with some language studies in Europe, since many European personality trait researchers mentioned about five to seven factors. Researchers suggested a new factor which they named as Humility, Honesty or Integrity in investigations conducted in Dutch, French, Polish, Czech, Italian, Hungarian, and Turkish (Ashton et al., 2006; Mlačić and Goldberg, 2007; Ashton et al., 2004).

Beside Humility-Honesty factor, dividing the factors into two groups as positive and negative components was proposed by some other researchers. Positive emotionality, negative emotionality, positive valence and negative valence in 7-factors were determined by researchers in investigations in Filipino, Hebrew, and Spanish (Ashton and Lee, 2001; Peabody and De Raad, 2002). In the same languages, Ashton and his colleagues conducted

six and seven factors studies, as Saucier, Hampton, and Goldberg (2000) reported the Big Five model investigations. Some academic performance predictors such as strategy usage and motivation are related to personality traits of students as well (Barrick and Mount, 1996; Zhang, 2003; Diseth, 2003; Bidjerano and Yun Dai, 2007; Swanberg and Martinsen, 2010; Clark and Schroth, 2010).

As for the assessment of the personality, tools may be suggested as having some flaws since each assessment tool belongs to a particular culture and language. Therefore, a tool may give different results in different cultures because of poor translation. But, some solutions have also been suggested to overwhelm this problem. Thus, it can be asserted that the problems of insufficient translation and cultural differences were overwhelmed by omitting the non-existing factors of the Big Five or adding the necessary factors to it. Besides, as the Big Five Factor Model is not confined to English language only, it is not confined only in Europe either.

2.1.5.11 The Big Five Studies out of Europe

The Big Five Factor Model was not used only in Europe, but in other parts of the world as well. There have been many Big Five studies in East Asia. Researchers have conducted investigations on the Big Five in countries like Japan, Korea and China, and these studies have sometimes positive and sometimes negative results about the five-factor model. In Western world, the individual is conceptualized as an independent self, but in countries like Japan, Korea and China individual personality is called as an interdependent self. Since the cultures of Japan, Korea and China are generally assumed as under power of Confucian culture, the interdependent self is considered to be stronger in these countries (Kim, 2005). Heine et al. (2001) indicate that it is important to understand a person's roles in the hierarchy of the society and carry out the duties and obligations for the people related to these roles.

In order to determine one's self, external evaluations by other people are particularly important in Japanese society and these external evaluations are regulated in accordance with interpersonal obligations and group roles (Kitayama and Uchida, 2003; Kitayama et al., 2004). The need for preserving the face and other impressions about being evaluated by others are also regulated by these external evaluations (Heine et al., 2008). So, Japanese people believe that all members of society have their perceived roles in public and cannot

express openly their ideas and opinions (Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Heine et al., 2001; Heine et al., 2002).

However, according to some researchers, the dichotomies 'collective-individual' and 'interdependent-independent' are false stereotype indicators of Western and Eastern cultures, as they suggest that collectivism can be seen more in Western cultures than it can be seen in so-called collectivist cultures. A recent study, for example, shows that while Japanese students more consider opinions of others' when they speak, American students more help others who need help (Noguchi, 2007). Noguchi (2007) explains this from a moralist aspect point of view that Americans help others for religious reasons. Heine et al. (2002) suggest that another reason for this may be the fact that people tend to compare themselves with other people in their own culture instead of comparing themselves to persons belonging to another culture.

In East Asian countries, the analyses and their results of the Big Five are rather diverse. Hofstede (2007) explains this diversity with the fact that the complicated nature of human relationships is not taken into account in personality inventories which are depending on criteria of collectivism and individualism in North America. Because of this, there are confusions between the factors of Intellect/Imagination and Conscientiousness, and the factors of Agreeableness and Extraversion in investigations in Japan, Korea and China, and the studies suggest that there may exist a sixth factor which can be termed as Dependence on Others according to Hofstede (2007). After they translated Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI) into English as Cross-Cultural Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI), researchers have noticed that the social nature is more emphasized by Asian personality investigators rather individualism (Cheung et al., 2003).

There have been investigations on the Big Five in China. In Chinese culture, an individual personality is not assumed separate from society and the Chinese equivalent for man consists of cultural and social context to construct an individual personality (Hsu, 1971). In order to reflect this characteristics of Chinese, personality researchers in China tried to develop some personality measurement instruments for Chinese lexicology only. It was seen that although Agreeableness and Extraversion intermingled among Chinese students, there was no sign for Openness factor. Comparison of the results from NEO-FFI (Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness Five Factor Inventory) to the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI) and the confirmatory factor analysis gave the data.

According to the results, Interpersonal Relatedness factor could not be measured with personality inventories like NEO-FFI belonging to Western traditions.

Researchers suggested that the existence of Interpersonal Relatedness factor in Asian cultures can be explained with their having higher value of interpersonal relationships than Western cultures. And the reason for this higher value of interpersonal relationships may be explained by the impact of Confucian ethics and beliefs (Cheung et al., 2001).

When they compared NEO-PI-R (Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness Personality Inventory-Revised) with QZPS (Chinese Personality Scale) Wang et al. (2005) made an investigation Factor Marker questionnaire lexical tradition. NEO-PI-R had five factors and QZPS had seven factors. According to results, it was concluded that NEO-PI-R with 5-factor did not completely correspond with the QZPS with 7-factor. Therefore, Chinese personality could not be explained properly by the Big Five. This was because emphasis was on judgment and evaluation of person in Eastern cultures, while the emphasis was on analysis and objective description of personal features in Western cultures. So it could be asserted that the items of NEO-PI-R were closer to Western type of personality and culture.

In a study of Lun and Bond (2006) in Hong Kong, group harmony was negatively correlated with Conscientiousness and Openness to Experience, but did not correlate significantly with Agreeableness and Extraversion.

There have been many the Big Five studies in Korea as well. In a study in Korea, NEO-PI-R was found in accordance with the Big Five model. In comparison with North American studies, Openness and Extraversion were lower and Neuroticism was higher. According to results, it was suggested that Korean participants had more tendency toward modesty and thought they could do less than their peers, maybe because of Confucian ethic (Yoon et al., 2002).

In another investigation among university students in Korea, three to seven factor solutions were given (Hahn et al., 1999). In Korean language, there are many terms of controlled intellect and these terms correlate with Conscientiousness positively. And maybe because of this, they make the factor Conscientiousness closer to the factor Intellect (Hahn et al., 1999). As a result, they asserted that a personality traits model of six-seven factors would be more suitable for Korean people.

There are Japanese Big Five Studies too. The Big Five model personality studies are fewer in Japanese language and culture. The study of Bond et al. (1975) is assumed as one of the first personality studies related to the Big Five. The researchers found out that Conscientiousness, Agreeableness and Extroversion were almost similar, but Culture and Emotional Stability factors seemed uncertain. It was thought that cultural differences were the causes of these uncertain factors and the behaviors depending on these factors were peculiar to each culture under the condition that these factors existed in those societies (Bond et al., 1975). However, because the sample size was small and the items in questionnaire were many, statistical results could not be generalized.

In his study which was accepted as the first Big Five in Japan, Isaka (1990) found ten factors and indicated that these factors correlated approximately with five factors in the study of Bond et al. (1975). Afterwards, some studies in Japanese language were shown in several journals of psychology as well (Kashiwagi et al., 1993; Kashiwagi and Yamada, 1995; Kashiwagi and Wada, 1996; Wada, 1996; Kashiwagi, 1999). Kashiwagi (2002) released a review of these investigations in English language and besides, organized two more studies where the factor Agreeableness was slightly correlated with the factor Conscientiousness and Extraversion factor with Openness factor. The studies of Kashiwagi had some faults as well as other Big Five investigations.

In their study, Yik et al. (2002) used a questionnaire of NEO-FFI 60 items to measure the personality. The obtained data were compared with the results of investigations in Korea, China, USA and Spain. According to the results, Extraversion and Neuroticism revealed the biggest correlation between affect and personality.

To sum up, studies on personality traits have been conducted in many different countries such as China, Korea and Japan and contexts such as East Asia among different cultures and in various languages. From this point of view, personality traits can be suggested as universal and not limited to any culture or language. The investigations have been conducted not only about determining the personality traits of people from different countries and cultures but also about the relations between personality traits and other factors such as motivation, academic success, academic performance etc.

2.1.5.12 Researches on Relations between Personality Traits and Other

Factors

Personality traits are significantly relevant to academic success of students (Lounsbury et al., 2004) and even to career success of people (Judge et al., 1999). Studies suggest that cognitive and non-cognitive personal varieties affect the development of knowledge (Furham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004). Personality traits are among these non-cognitive individual differences and some studies show that in comparison with cognitive ability, Big Five personality traits predict academic success more (Furham et al., 2003; Furham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004; O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007).

How the Big Five personality traits influence the grade point average (GPA), individual score, satisfaction, cognitive and affective academic performance are investigated by many researchers (Rothstein et al., 1994; Trapmann et al., 2007). It has been found out that Big Five personality traits are directly related somehow to academic performance (Duff et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007; Barchard, 2003; Trapmann et al., 2007; O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007) and predict academic performance better than other factors like learning styles. However, in an investigation in Turkey, personality traits have no significant relations with the gender, departments and GPAs of the participants (Yanardöner, 2010).

Among the Big Five personality traits academic achievement is predicted most significantly and consistently by Conscientiousness (O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007; Duff et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007; Barchard, 2003). Studies show that Conscientiousness is not positively related only to academic achievement but to academic success (Barchard, 2003; Nofle and Robins, 2007), GPA, individual score (Paunonen and Ashton, 2001; Laidra et al., 2007; Duff et al., 2004) and to grades as well (Chamorro-Premuzic and Furham, 2003; Oswald et al., 2004; Kappe and van de Flier, 2010). According to these results, students with high Conscientiousness scores may be better than students with low Conscientiousness scores in academic studies.

Openness is another major personality trait to contribute to academic performance. It is asserted that academic success is positively predicted by Openness (Barchard, 2003). In another study, Openness positively predicted classroom performance and GPA (Rothstein et al., 1994). Even in an investigation conducted on students from elementary and secondary school, Openness was found as a significant contributor to academic achievement (Laidra et al., 2007). Among undergraduate students, a study found out that

students with high Openness scores had higher scores in the SAT (Scholastic Assessment Test) verbal test (Noffle and Robins, 2007). However, it was found out in an investigation in Turkey that Openness was negatively related to academic self-regulation and self-efficacy (Şenler, 2011).

Beside to the studies with positive connection between academic success and Openness, there are also studies with contradicting findings, asserting that Openness does not affect academic success at all (O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007). However, there are a few mixed results for some personality traits such as Extroversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. These results suggest a negative relationship between academic performance and these three personality traits. According to the study of Furham and Chamorro-Premuzic (2004), students with high grades had low scores in Extroversion. But Extraversion was negatively related to examination grades (Chamorro-Premuzic and Furham, 2003) and academic success (Duff et al., 2004). In another study, Agreeableness was found to have a negative relationship with GPA (Rothstein et al., 1994) and was negatively related to classroom performance. Extraversion was also negatively correlated to GPA (Oswald et al., 2004).

Academic motivation and personality traits have also been investigated. In a study cooperative, hypercompetitive and personal development motivational orientations are explained by personality traits (Ross et al., 2003). In another study, investigators found out that the strongest learning goal orientation was recorded for students with high Openness, Extraversion and Conscientiousness (Payne et al., 2007). However, students with low Extraversion and high Neuroticism may be afraid of being failed and try to avoid participating in activities. And together with Agreeableness, Neuroticism has positive relations with academic self-regulation and self-efficacy (Şenler, 2011).

In another investigation, it was found out that Openness and Extraversion explained motivation of engagement to improve oneself better and Neuroticism, Openness and Conscientiousness explained motivation of achievement to carry on and finish a task better (Komarraju and Karau, 2005). Neuroticism and Extraversion were positively associated with motivation of avoiding related to anxiety causing negative feeling towards learning and school but Conscientiousness and Openness were negatively related with it. Likewise, Conscientiousness and Extraversion were positively related with motivation of achievement but Neuroticism, impulsiveness and fear of failure were negatively associated with it (Heaven, 1990; Kanfer et al., 1996; Busato et al., 1999; De Guzman et al., 2003).

The importance of the personality traits to predict the academic achievement and academic motivation of college students was investigated in another study (Komarraju et al., 2009). The participants were 308 undergraduate college students from different departments. According to correlation analyses, the relationships between the Big Five personality traits, academic achievement and motivation were significant.

Kao and Craigie (2014) conducted a study to explore the effect of English usage on Facebook (EUF) and the Big Five. The participants were 164 Taiwanese university EFL (English as a foreign language) students. The results showed that individual variations in EUF were related to some personality dimensions. Besides, together EUF and the Big Five personality traits affected EFL learning significantly.

Pourfeiz (2015) conducted a study to explore whether there were any relationships between PTs and attitudes of students for foreign language learning. 157 state university EFL students (102 female and 55 male) in Turkey participated in the study. At the end of the study, not only attitudes towards learning English and the Big Five but also components of attitudes towards learning English and Big-Five personality traits were positively correlated.

Arif et al. (2012) conducted a study to find out the Big five personality traits of prospective teachers. 100 (60 female; 40 male) prospective teachers from public universities in Punjab, Pakistan participated in the study. According to the results, Openness personality trait has the highest ratio among other traits, and the rest four traits (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Neuroticism) had nearly same ratio.

In another study, the relationship between emotional intelligence and personality traits in learning mathematics and English was investigated (Homayouni, 2011). 110 students from a university participated in the study. According to the results, Extroversion, Openness and Agreeableness were positively correlated with English learning.

The relationship between online learning motivation and satisfaction and personality traits was investigated in another study (Shih et al., 2013). The participants were 153 (116 male and 37 female) tertiary level EFL freshmen students. According to results, there was a correlation between personality traits and online satisfaction.

De Feyter et al. (2012) examined the relationship between the personality traits and academic performance of college students and influence of personality traits on academic

performance of students. The participants were 375 students (60% male and 40% female) of a university college in Belgium. According to results, personality traits affect academic performance and academic motivation.

In Turkey, a Big Factor Personality Inventory is developed from Big Factor Personality Model to measure normal personality characteristics and each factor in this inventory has 17 sub-dimensions (Somer et al., 2002). Again in our country, language learning strategies, personality traits and their relations with each other were investigated in another study (Asmali, 2014). The participants were 149 freshmen and sophomore students (88 male and 61 female) of a vocational school of a state university in Turkey. According to the results, personality plays a prominent role in deciding for the best strategy for language learning. Another study is dedicated to age, learning strategies and personality traits where personality traits are significantly correlated with language learning strategy groups (Ayhan, 2016). In another investigation, adult participants have shown high Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness and low Agreeableness and Neuroticism (Gülgöz, 2002).

In another study, Yıldırım (2003) found out that Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness had positive relations with ability for empathy and he suggested that these four factors predicted the empathy effect variable positively. And Yanardöner (2010) found out that most of the participants in his study had Agreeableness personality trait and Openness came as the second.

In his study, Kahveci (2001) investigated the differences between personality traits according to gender and found out some gender variance in Agreeableness and Conscientiousness dimensions. Men had higher scored in Agreeableness and women had higher scores in Conscientiousness. Besides, extraverted individuals had less difficulty while taking psychological guidance. However, introverted individuals did not apply for psychological guidance until their psychological problems compel them.

In other investigations it has been also determined that personality traits can affect emotional intelligence of individuals (Sudak and Zehir, 2013) and there are important relations between personality traits and conflict management styles of people (Erkuş and Tabak, 2011) and personality traits may affect life-satisfaction (Erdemir, 2000). Besides, personality has been determined as the mediator variable among decreased impulse control, distraction and loneliness (Günay, 2011). However, adults' loneliness has a moderate positive relation with Neuroticism and negative relations with Extraversion and

Agreeableness; and these three personality traits predict loneliness significantly as well (Atak, 2009).

Moreover, personality traits significantly predict the adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism as well (Ulu, 2007). And there is a significant relation between personality traits and subjective well-being; Extraversion and Conscientiousness positively and Neuroticism negatively predict the subjective well-being (Malkoç, 2011).

There are also significant relations between personality traits and work performance of sales representatives (Ordun, 2002), job performances (Yelboğa, 2006; Gültekin, 2009), organizational loyalty and workers' performances (Şeker, 2011), work success together with responsibility, work satisfaction and organizational loyalty (Şirin, 2012), influence strategies (Alkış, 2015) and negotiation strategies (Gürsel, 2009; Yürür, 2009). Besides, according to a study about personality traits, significant relations are determined between EFL instructors and their classroom management efficacy (Öner, 2012).

Also there are significant relationships between dispositional and optimistic situational coping and Neuroticism (Ekşi, 2004). In another study, Neuroticism and Openness traits predict job satisfaction and locus of control, and a significant difference is detected between the personality factors of managers and workers (Demirkan, 2006).

Extroversion and Introversion tendencies are investigated in another study (Abalı, 2006) and it is determined that the ways they communicate in English are different. Extravert people speak first through introducing new topics and making restatements and utter longer sentences, but introverts prefer only asking questions.

In sum, a brief history of personality is given at the beginning of this part. This information comprises character and temperament as two aspects of personality and their differences. Also factors that are composing personality are discussed. These factors are hereditary and physical factors and environmental and social factors of personality. Although these factors seem different from each other, they are closely related and interwoven in themselves and it seems difficult to separate one factor from the others. After factors of personality are given, personality theories are discussed. There are four personality theories; psychoanalytic, behavioristic, humanistic and trait and factor theories. The characteristics of each theory is given and their similarities and differences from each other, and their deficiencies and good sides are discussed. And as for the last remark in this part the history of personality traits is also given. The inventories used to determine personality traits

before the Big Five, how the Big Five is accepted as the most compromising and universal inventory to measure personality traits, the difficulties of translating personality traits in different languages are discussed. And the examples of the studies conducted on personality traits in different cultures and languages are given at the end of this part. In the next part, personality traits and their relations with foreign language learning will be discussed.

2.1.6 Personality Traits and Foreign Language Learning

After brief information about the history of personality traits is given in previous section, personality traits and foreign language learning, their relations with each other, the prominent traits in foreign language learning are discussed in this part.

2.1.6.1 History of Personality Traits in Foreign Language Learning

Traces of personality traits can be found on foreign language learning (FLL) about affective and non-linguistic dimensions in history. Many psychology researchers such as Eysenck (1992), Eysenck and Eysenck (1985), and Costa and McCrae (1992) noted the strong relation between affect and Neuroticism and Extraversion. Also some other researchers such as Watson and Clark (1992) noted that affective factors like self-esteem and confidence had relationships to some extent with Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. It may be asserted that personality can explain the reasons of foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy because affect has important influence on foreign language speaking.

Personality variables may affect the extent a foreign language can be learned (Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; Robinson et al., 1994; MacIntyre and Charos, 1996; Leaver et al., 2005; Ehrman, 2008; Sharp, 2009). Personality traits are defined as personality tendencies of Myers-Briggs, emotional stability, assertiveness and Extroversion in many researches. It is assumed that these personality traits are related with successful foreign language learning (Reiss, 1983; Ehrman et al., 2003). Among the personality traits, Extroversion and Introversion are the most common ones, maybe because these two traits have been accepted as fundamentals of personality theories. Extroversion and Introversion also have key importance for two main personality theories; these are Costa and McCrae's (1992) the Big Five model and three-factor model of Eysenck (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1991).

It is obvious that affect has a great influence on foreign language speaking. Because of this fact, it can be asserted that personality is crucial and has to be handled with care by researches of FLL in order to understand the reasons of FLSA and FLSSE. But, the first findings of researches did not confirm these relations and it was stated that personality variables could not be directly related with foreign language learning (Lalonde and Gardner, 1984). Personality traits and their relations with strategies have been investigated as well in FLL. It was observed that good foreign language learners could determine the best-suiting strategies for themselves according to their introvert or extrovert personalities (Oxford and Nyikos, 1989). Also as opposed to many of the previous studies (Dewaele and Furnham, 1999; Dewaele, 2007; Wakamoto, 2007; Howard, 2010) and according to the results of approximately 4000 cases (Ehrman, 2008), the most successful foreign language learners were found to have precise, intuitive, logical and introvert personality traits. It is asserted that extrovert learners are more successful, because they are more energetic and positive in language learning activities and they are more involved in performances (Robinson et al., 1994; Kiany, 1997; Kiany, 1998), and foreign language teachers have been in favor of this point as well (Gregersen, 2003; Zhang, 2009).

Self-esteem, analytic orientation, deliberateness, field dependence, field independence, creativity, empathy and anxiety were included in personality traits investigations in 1970s and 1980s. However, only anxiety in this list was considered as a personality aspect of an individual by psychologists. It can be asserted that pioneers of FLL researchers did not pay much attention to this point. In many of the previous studies about relations between personality variables and foreign language learning, Extraversion was the more attractive among the traits, maybe because extravert students were assumed more successful, especially in communication in a foreign language. Success of extravert students became a common belief. It may be because of this belief that many personality researchers in FLL have investigated the Extraversion and Introversion aspects of personality of learners and have been interested in who are more successful in foreign language learning, extraverts or introverts. Actually, in their researches on Extraversion and Introversion characteristics of personality, most of the FLL personality investigators did their researches according to the course grades and/or standardized test scores of the students and tried to find out who would be, extraverts or introverts, more successful at language learning. There was no one fixed correct result but rather, results were not favoring either. It is also suggested by some personality theorists such as Eysenck and Eysenck (1985) that extravert language learners

are faster, more willing because they have rather ineffective memory and functional processing in comparison with introverts. The idea that Introversion may better predict success in foreign language learning can be enhanced for foreign language teaching as well (Leaver et al., 2005).

2.1.6.2 Researches on Personality Traits in Foreign Language Learning

In some researches, personality variables and their influence on foreign language learners' proficiency have been investigated and it has been determined that personality traits have significant correlations with foreign language achievement. For instance, in an investigation about the personality traits and their effect on achievement levels of 84 college students of an intermediate French class at the University of Kentucky was conducted by Smart et al. (1970). The results showed that introverted students were more successful and students' personality differences could determine their academic performance.

Another investigation was conducted by Chastain (1975) to find out the relationships between outgoing versus reserved personalities and final course grade of 229 college students who were beginning level students of French, German, and Spanish language courses. The results showed that Extraversion and final grades of German and Spanish learners had a significant positive relationship while Extroversion was not correlated to the final grades of French language students; this result indicated that language achievement of these two languages was positively influenced by Extroversion trait.

Another investigation was conducted by Busch (1982) to find out the relationships between proficiency and Introversion - Extraversion levels of participants in English learning. The participants were 185 EFL learners in Japan. According to the results, no significant relationship between Introversion-Extraversion and performance on English proficiency tests was determined; only Extraversion and pronunciation were negatively but significantly correlated with each other; and introverts were better in English pronunciation maybe because they were less impulsive. Besides, extraverted female students showed lower oral proficiency scores than male students.

In their study, Robinson et al. (1994) explored the relationships between language learning ability differences and personality traits of 45 French as a foreign language students at Sydney University, Australia. The results showed that personality traits were significantly correlated to foreign language learning; this result contradicted Wilson and Lynn's (1990)

previous research results. In another study, the relationships between personality traits and end-of-training proficiency grades of 855 adults in an intensive training at an Institute were investigated (Ehrman and Oxford, 1995). Proficiency ratings were seen positively and significantly correlated to personality traits.

In 1990s, Ehrman made investigations on foreign language learning and observed the habits and features of successful language learners. She was among the researchers of traits and habits of language learners and investigated personality in foreign language learning. These personality-related studies have been extensively referred. She was interested in the theory suggesting that extraverts were better foreign language learners and communicators than introverts (1990). And Ehrman (1990) made investigations to find out whether extravert students were better at learning a foreign language and communicating in it than introvert students through some Likert-scale surveys like Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (M/BTI). The sample size was very large with 1000 students, but at the end, no significant difference was discovered between extravert and introvert students. According to the results of this study, she hypothesizes that most part of a language appears in combinations of two. And she also suggests that these combinations are appropriate for both extravert and introvert people. According to the same researcher, extravert students may have better chance in group activities which require participation of many students such as whole class.

Another study was conducted by Daele et al. (2006) to investigate the trait Extraversion's effect on oral fluency, complexity, and accuracy in Belgium. The participants were 25 Dutch-speaking students who learned both English as a foreign and French as a second language. It was found out that Extraversion was significantly correlated to lexical complexity with French and near-significantly with English.

Ehrman in her investigation in 2008, had 3,145 participants as a sample. These participants were native English speaking students and they were attending intensive foreign language programs in the USA. According to the data analysis, ISTJ (introversion, sensing, thinking, judgment) personality type students were the highest. After a study with small sample group, there was only one group having shown significance. And this group was INTJ (introverted, intuitive, thinking, and judging) and it formed 16.5% of the total sampling. But this study was criticized because of small sample size which implied to be between 60 and 70. Actually, both instrument and statistical methods could be criticized. Current

psychologists think the M/BTI has low psychometric qualities as it requires a ‘Yes, No and sometimes Maybe’ (dichotomous) answering key system rather than a Likert scale with ordinal data. Second, it can be asserted that chi-squared questionnaires depending on categorical and nonparametric data cannot be generalized because they are specific for only that sample and they do not have statistical power. And third, there is no external validity on correlational analyses depending on chi-squared test results and accordingly, it is not possible to generalize these results for whole sample population.

During the studies in North America on Extraversion-Introversion EFL learners, some FLL studies on Extraversion-Introversion learners were similarly conducted in EFL context in Asia. Iwawaki et al. (1980) investigated correlations among English achievement tests and Extraversion-Introversion in Japan. In this study, they used Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) containing 86 items. The test results obtained from by the EPQ did not show any significant differences between Extraversion-Introversion learners most probably because of low sample size, the abundance of questionnaire items, depending on test scores instead of standardized z-score variables (Iwawaki et al., 1980).

Personality and its effects on foreign language learning have long been investigated. One of the studies was dedicated to find out the differences on how introvert and extravert students perceive foreign language learning belonged to Moody (1988). According to the findings, extravert students were found to be more interactive and better in oral tests, though introvert students tended to be alone and better in written tests; sensing students were good to memorize facts in details and good at objective choice tests, whereas intuitive students understood general notions and were better in essay tests.

Another study to determine whether extravert learners had better advantage than introvert learners was done with university students in Japan (Busch, 1982). As outcome variables, Busch used the course grades of the students. One of the previous studies was a good learner study and according to the results, Extraversion was thought helpful for communication skills by 31% of the participants (Naiman et al., 1975). And these results were cited by Busch as well. However, although 31% of the participants found Extraversion helpful for communication skills, 69% of participants voted for an opposing idea, and said they did not find Extraversion helpful (Griffiths, 1991). Actually, it was a reality that Busch could not find any significant differences between course grades of extraverts and introvert students. In addition to this, there was another flaw in this study;

only English course grades from an individual English teacher were used, and it was disputable whether an enough objective measure of general English proficiency was achieved or not. What was included in term proficiency may have affected the results as well. If examinations to measure written proficiency are included, then introvert learners can be expected to have higher grades than extrovert learners. In order to assess English productive skills as reliable and valid as possible, speaking or writing examinations should be evaluated by two, three or more evaluators because nonlinguistic factors like a person's speaking self-efficacy and self-competence beliefs are influenced by her/his personality. After this evaluation, a healthy correlational analysis with personality traits can be possible.

A similar study was dedicated to the investigation of the relations between oral proficiency and Introversion-Extroversion factors of personality traits in foreign language learning, in Turkey (Atbaş, 1997). In this study, the participants were prep school students of a Turkish university. According to the results, no significant correlation was detected between oral proficiency components and Introversion-Extroversion factors, but a slight correlation was detected between pronunciation and Introversion.

In another study in our country, the relationship between personality traits and foreign language learning was investigated (Erton, 2004). At the end of the study, a low correlation between personality traits and learners' learning styles and strategies was determined. In his another study, Erton (2010) investigated personality traits and their relations with foreign language learning styles and foreign language success. According to the results, personality traits had low relations with learning styles and success of the learners. However, in another study personality traits had no relations with learning styles of students (Yanardöner, 2010).

2.1.6.3 Researches on Personality Traits in FLL in Other Countries

Nonetheless, in some studies, there was not any relation between foreign language learning and personality and if there was, the relation was very weak. Carrell et al. (1996) had another study in EFL setting. They tried to figure out whether there was a relationship between achievement tests and Extraversion-Introversion. Their sample was 76 EFL college students at a university in Indonesia. As a personality questionnaire, they used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Carrell et al., 1996) like Ehrman and Oxford used MBTI inventory as well (Ehrman and Oxford, 1990; Oxford and Ehrman, 1992). At the

end of the study and according to the results, Carrell et al. discovered just low correlations between foreign language learning and personality types like in the study of Iwawaki et al. The flaws in study of Carrell et al. were similar to the flaws of studies of Busch (1982) and Iwawaki et al. (1980). The abundance of questionnaire items, small sample size and using the poor M/BTI instrument psychometric characteristics might have caused this failure. Rastegar (2002) found out that Extraversion and proficiency in EFL were not related to each other significantly among students of Kerman and Shiraz University. Karami (2001) noted that grammatical proficiency and personality traits among students were not significantly different either.

Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) was used in another study in Sri Lanka on language learning strategies and personality types among students whose ages were 16 to 18 (Liyanage and Bartlett, 2013). The findings have supported the theories of connection between language learning and personality and the assumption that foreign language learning is connected with personality traits.

Fazeli (2012) investigated the importance of personality traits to predict the Social English Language Learning Strategies (SELLSs) of EFL students. The participants were 213 3rd year female students of English major. Personality traits were found to have a significant relation with the use of SELLSs; however, use of the SELLSs could not be strongly predicted by personality traits.

According to research findings, personality traits have significant relationships with FLL achievement and some of the personality traits are negatively and some others positively correlated. Particularly, these relationships were determined inconsistent and affected by research methods (Daele et al., 2006), teaching and evaluation methods (Smart et al., 1970), culturally determined role behavior (Busch, 1982), learning and testing environments (Carrell et al., 1996), gender (Wilson and Lynn, 1990), target language (Chastain, 1975) and proficiency level (Smart et al., 1970).

2.1.6.4 Personality Traits and Self-Identities of Foreign Language

Teachers

Besides personality traits, types of selves and self-identities of foreign language teachers should also be mentioned. Possible selves were classified by Markus and Nurius (1986), Higgins (1987) and accepted to motivate and direct foreign language teacher behavior. These possible language teacher selves are the feared language teacher-self, the ought-self

and the ideal teacher-self (Higgins et al., 1994; Kubanyiova, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2009). Ideal teacher-self refers to identity, constitutes future images of identity goals and aspirations of the language teacher. Ought-to language teacher-self is about the expectations of the people, administration, inspection, institutions and professional ethics and refers to how traits which a person believes s/he ought to have, are represented in one's mind mentally and experientially (Higgins, 1987). And feared language teacher-self occurs when the ideal language teacher-self and ought-to language teacher-self clash due to lack of enough education and experiences and it represents the fears an English teacher wants to avoid anyhow (Carver et al., 1994). Beside of the feared language teacher-self, the ought-self and the ideal teacher-self, there is professional teacher-self which is a possible L2 self (Demirezen, 2015j) and is built up during whole teaching career of a teacher (Demirezen, 2015k). It requires two selves, ideal language teacher-self and ought-to language teacher-self, but avoids the feared language teacher-self. English teachers with professional language teacher-selves are knowledgeable and confident because they are native-like efficiency in English with intelligible, accurate and fluent pronunciation and intonation (Demirezen, 2015k).

In sum, personality traits are also closely related to FLL as well. FLL and its relations with personality traits, personality traits and their influence on foreign language learners' proficiency, academic success, Extraversion-Introversion tendencies and foreign language learning abilities are discussed above. Besides, the investigations on relations between foreign language learning and personality traits have been conducted in different continents and countries. And as for the last remark, personality traits have influence on not only foreign language learners but foreign language teachers as well.

2.1.7 The Big Five and Foreign Language Learning

It can be asserted that the Big Five presents a complete outline of individuals' motivational, attitudinal, experiential and interpersonal traits and their emotions (Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham, 2003). Personality traits are significant factors to describe the interaction between people in their cultures and in social groups.

Extroversion is seen as having direct relationship with foreign language speaking self-efficacy and at the same time, it has weak relationship with foreign language speaking anxiety. This is because extroverted learners can be more active and more engaged in tasks during classes and as a consequence, their choice may increase their speaking self-efficacy

and decrease their foreign language speaking anxiety. So, Extroversion can be asserted to be directly connected with foreign language speaking anxiety. Openness may lead more speaking self-efficacy (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996; Apple, 2011). Neurotic learners are not eager to take part in activities and tasks in classes and emotional states like nervousness and anxiousness of learners constitute the Neuroticism which affects learners' self-efficacy. Therefore, if learners have lower Neuroticism, they may have higher speaking self-efficacy in the classes. It was found out that Neuroticism influenced foreign language speaking self-efficacy moderately.

Conscientiousness means the perception of the learners about in and out class contexts and their prospective objectives. Because disciplined and responsible learners with high Conscientiousness trait are better prepared and have good study habits, they are more successful in their English classes; so it can be suggested that Conscientiousness has weak direct influence on foreign language speaking self-efficacy (Apple, 2011). And Agreeableness is firmly related with foreign language speaking self-efficacy. People with high degree of Agreeableness are more biased for sympathizing and cooperation with other people (John et al., 2008). When foreign language learning is considered, this trait might make people to use target language more and consequently might help to increase their speaking self-efficacy. As a summary, it can be inferred that high levels of Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness and Extroversion may improve foreign language speaking self-efficacy (Apple, 2011).

If teachers are aware of students' personality types, they may understand the classes better and decide on the most effective teaching techniques and methods (Wilz, 2000). It has also been asserted that if teachers understand the personality traits of their students, they can also understand why class activities are approached in different ways by students and the reasons of success and failure of them for the same goals (Oxford and Ehrman, 1992; Wilz 2000).

Researches on the Big Five and foreign language learning are various. The studies have shown that Willingness to Communicate (WTC) in FLL is related to personality traits (Lalonde and Gardner, 1984; MacIntyre, and Charos, 1996; Shimizu, 1999; O'Connor and Paunonen, 2007; Apple, 2011). MacIntyre and Charos (1996) used the Big Five in their investigation. This investigation is accepted as one of the earliest studies in language learning using the Big Five. It was also first because of using Willingness to Communicate

(WTC) in language learning concept for the first time. A model which accepted willingness to communicate as a personality trait among native speakers was developed before (McCroskey and Richmond, 1987). These investigators wanted to see whether this could be done among foreign speakers and they did their investigation to see whether each dimension of the Big Five had positive contribution to motivation and willingness to communicate in FLL. They also theorized that the contribution of the Big Five to motivation and willingness to communicate was not direct, but rather indirect. There were 92 participants in the study and 99 items in the questionnaire (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996).

A model of attitudes, willingness to communicate and personality was formed in accordance with the research of MacIntyre and Gardner (1994). They supposed that social individuals such as extraverted people were expected to feel less anxious when they were speaking with foreign language group members. Since the last research did not show a big relation between general trait anxiety and foreign language anxiety, it was hypothesized by the researchers that emotional stability would not point straight to anxiety in foreign language. It is also assumed that people with negative attitudes towards foreign language speaking members feel distressed when they speak with members of foreign language group. Based on this assumption, emotional stability was found to be related to integrativeness in the above-mentioned study. At the end, the researchers came to a conclusion that personality showed an indirect effect towards willingness to communicate when the disguised variables of perceived competence, foreign language anxiety, integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation were taken into consideration (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996). But although there were very few participants, there were a lot of variables like FLL personality studies in the past. At the beginning, McCroskey and Richmond's model was used in the analysis, but later researchers had to add more dimensions because variables were more than the participants. At the end of the study, the significance was seen adequate, but still the small sample size was not convincing.

MacIntyre and Charos (1996) had some results at the end of their study and these were mentioned above. According to these results, MacIntyre et al. (1998) suggested heuristic pyramid model for WTC in foreign language. In this heuristic pyramid model, personality rests in Layer VI: Social and Individual Context which is the ground level. Personality does not directly influence foreign language learning in this pyramid model but instead,

personality is accepted as a helping element for the context where foreign language learning happens (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Some other variables such as native and foreign language groups' atmosphere, linguistic self-efficacy and exposure to foreign language speakers can influence the social context.

Another investigation on the Big Five and English language learning was conducted in Japan. The sample was 320 students at a university. The instrument for this study was the Yawate Guilford Personality Inventory with acronyms (Y/GPI). This inventory was a pre-Big Five personality traits and pre-PEN instrument. It consisted of 12 subscales, and each scale had 10 items (Brown et al., 2001). In this study, totally there were six instruments to measure overall English proficiency, English grammar level, usage of strategies, anxiety, motivation and personality. Including the sub-scales as well, it was claimed by the researchers that total number of the analyzed variables was 34. But total variables in instrument were more than the number of participants. So, it was difficult to mention a convincing predictive power and correlational analyses did not reveal a significant value.

In his PhD dissertation, Apple (2011) examined the confidence in foreign language speaking and big five personality traits among EFL students in Japan. Apple developed his own foreign language speaking confidence scale for his study.

Another study on foreign language learning and the Big Five was Verhoeven and Vermeer's (2002) study. In their study, Verhoeven and Vermeer investigated the relations between communicative competence and the Big Five personality traits. The study was not for English language communicative competence, and it was in Dutch. The investigation was done among native Dutch-speakers and non-native Dutch-speakers. According to the results, some items of the Big Five such as Openness and Conscientiousness had significant correlations with different features of communicative competence. But these results can be disputable because of several reasons; the instrument to measure the personality traits was depending on the Big Five instead of a definite current instrument; besides, not students themselves, but students' teachers evaluated the personality items; so it was uncertain whether teachers had evaluated accurately; and the small number of participants might have caused nonparametric data delivery, and because of this, the results could not be generalized for other samples.

Regarding the studies on relationships between internet usage and the Big Five, extrovert people have more online friends in internet than other people (Ong et al., 2011). Also these

people linger around on social networks in internet than those who use internet less (Wilson et al., 2010). Besides, high neurotic people are biased to low emotional stability and anxiety and their social relations are generally poor (Moore and McElroy, 2012). Thus, it can be asserted that neurotic people are more inclined to be afraid of interacting on internet, maybe because they are not self-reliant enough in English and feel more anxious and embarrassed. According to a recent study which supports the findings that EFL success is negatively affected by Neuroticism, it can be suggested that Neuroticism contributes to poor EFL success incidentally (Kao, 2012). There is also a finding about Conscientiousness; conscious students are expected to be more engaged in academic targets, especially related to using online internet sources (McElroy et al., 2007). And according to a study on extraverted and introverted English teachers, participations of students and their student-student interactions in classes of extraverted teachers are found to be higher than the students in classes of introverted teachers (Bulut, 1992).

To sum up, it can be asserted that foreign language learning (FLL) and personality traits are closely connected to each other. There have been many investigations about FLL, self-efficacy, anxiety, willingness to communicate in foreign language and their relations with personality traits. The results show that Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness and Extroversion positively and Neuroticism negatively affect foreign language learning.

2.2 Background of Speaking

In this part the definition and theory of speaking are given. After speaking skill is defined and related theories are given, the productive and interaction aspects of speaking are discussed. In addition, before the background of anxiety is discussed, speaking and communicative competence are accounted.

2.2.1 Definition and Theory

Speaking skill is more often used than writing skill. This may explain the fact that although there are 3000 spoken languages, only 200 of them have written languages (Tompkins, 1998). Speaking is a kind of method or verbal means to communicate or convey meaning (Owens, 2015). It is also the usage of verbal or non-verbal symbols in various contexts to build and share meaning (Chaney and Burk, 1998). However, speaking is accepted as one of the most complex fields in foreign language learning since it has connections and relations with an important number of other activities and areas (Hughes, 2013). According to Harris (1969), speaking is a complex skill because it requires simultaneous usage of

various abilities; and speaking a language requires developing some complex skills and various kinds of knowledge such as when and how to communicate (Burns and Joyce, 1997). In other words, it is necessary to understand psycholinguistic and interpersonal factors of speech production in which meanings, process and forms are involved and how these factors can occur in speaking (Kaplan, 2010).

Foreign language learning consists of four main skills; reading, writing, listening and speaking and all these four skills are required to be proficient in order to communicate and interact in a foreign language. However, speaking in foreign language is the intention of many foreign language learners (Ur, 2008). In other words, success in foreign language learning is based on learners' accomplishment in communication skills (Nunan, 2006), so speaking can be accepted as the mirror of a learner's foreign language knowledge and naturally occurs as an important skill among the four skills.

Speaking, which can be accepted as a communicative and productive skill, has different aspects that have been discussed in similar ways by different researchers. Harmer (2007) describes two major categories for speaking in communication. These are accuracy which means the correct usage of grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary and the fluency which means speaking continuously without any break. Accuracy requires not only the correct language usage but the usage of appropriate linguistic forms according to the situations as well. Besides, speaking a language uninterruptedly and spontaneously means fluency. And for a successful interaction between interlocutors, accuracy and coherence should accompany to fluency. In speaking, these two aspects, accuracy and fluency, are interrelated to each other because without any of them oral communication may fail.

According to Bygate (1987), knowledge of language and the skill to use that knowledge are necessary for communication through speaking. These knowledge and skill can be considered as two aspects of communication as well. In his competence and performance issue, Chomsky (2014) asserts that some amount of knowledge should be acquired before production of language. And the language stored by individuals during their lives consists of competence. Competence is the specific system of rules and these rules make up an individual's language knowledge (Richards and Schmidt, 2013). According to this definition, people understand or make new sentences which they have never experienced before as the result of competence mechanism. However, performance is the real usage of language (Richards and Schmidt, 2013). Performance is different from competence in a

sense that performance cannot reflect the competence properly because of various reasons. This means that performance cannot always show real competence. Spoken performance can be limited or cannot be observed sometimes, but this does not prove that the individual does not have any spoken competence.

Again according to Bygate (1987), people do not just assemble the sentences but they take circumstances into consideration as well. They decide, implement their decisions and adjust their conversations as problems occur. Speaking skill is the ability to say something in interaction. During conversation interlocutors decide when to initiate new points and when and how to bring the conversation to an end. These features may prove that oral interaction is a changeable and lively process. The interactions' quality, content, length and its size may vary according to many variables and the similarity of the circumstances does not guarantee the similarity of these factors. Some various reasons to affect oral interaction negatively may be bad mood, bad concentration on the tasks, being nervous, anxiety etc.

Learners may have fluency in their foreign language productions through automatization process (Gatbonton and Segalowitz, 1988). They divide the fluency concept into two; the ability to select and the ability to produce the utterances. The selection phase includes what to, whom to, how to and when to say. And the second, production phase requires rapidly and fluently production of the utterances. However, the selection phase does not guarantee the success of the production phase. People may mentally prepare and monitor their utterances in foreign language during a conversation but still they may not speak fluently, since fluency requires automaticity which means the ability to speak at a normal speed. And big automaticity may result in quick recognition, then grammatically and communicatively correct speech. According to Gatbonton and Segalowitz (1988), automatization can be achieved through proper communicative activities. They divide the automatization process into two; the first phase consists of the main activity which requires repeated utterances of the learner and the second phase consists of the follow up activity to make more communicative exercises. Automatization has some benefits in foreign language development (Kirkland, 1984). According to Kirkland (1984), native input may be increased if a learner has conversation with a native speaker. Thus, learners may develop more speaking automatization when they are exposed to native input.

Bygate (1987) suggests that speaking consists of production and interaction skills. And two conditions may affect these two skills; the first is processing condition where the time for

speech is limited and the second is reciprocity condition where there are interactions between interlocutors. Many factors may limit the speaking time of a speaker and so, pressure may occur. However, some factors such as speaking tension and mood, length and context of the speech may affect the reciprocity conditions as well. These factors can be called as destructors which are public speaking, general speaking anxiety etc. and initiators which are speaking with intimate friends, family members etc.

Harmer (2007) describes some elements for a fluent speech as social and mental processing and knowing the language features. Language features consist of the negotiation language which means speaker's and listener's understanding each other; lexis and grammar including some functions such as expressing approval, disapproval, surprise etc.; expressive devices which provide change in pitch and stress; and connected speech which means the modification (assimilation) and omission (elision) and linking sounds (linking r).

According to Harmer (2007), mental-social processing should be considered together with language features to achieve a successful interaction. Mental-social processing consists of language processing which means proper selection and organization of the words; interaction with others which means communication between interlocutors; and information processing on the spot which means the processing of the received information.

2.2.2 Production and Speaking

Reading, writing, listening and speaking comprise the main four language skills and they can be grouped as receptive and productive skills; receptive skills are reading and listening and productive skills are speaking and writing where language knowledge such as vocabulary, grammar and social knowledge are necessary to communicate orally or in written way. Bygate (1987) asserts that written and spoken forms of sentences are different and without any discrimination of languages, written expressions are not same as their oral ones. The style determines the features and the forms. Since the time is limited in spoken language, there are some constraints which are called as processing conditions (Bygate, 1987). Speaking is a real time activity of an interaction between listener and speaker. In this interaction, communication between two parts should continue and this proves the spontaneity of speaking (Thornbury, 2006; Louma, 2009). Time is more limited in

speaking than writing and this may mean that speaking can be a less planned activity than writing.

Time pressure can limit and modify the oral production. Thus, speaker can use some devices to speak easier and try to avoid some difficult words through compensation. Compensation means using the easiest expression, rephrasing the words and trying to be clearer. Compensation devices include some components like repetition, substitution, reformulating, self-correction and rephrasing. And generally they are used when people feel they are not understood, misunderstood or to be better understood. Learners need help to overcome the barriers before speaking, so facilitation and compensation features may help them speak. When people speak in their native languages, they do not pay attention on the ways they speak. However, when they speak in a foreign language, they monitor themselves to be accurate and comprehensible. According to Krashen (1981), this monitoring may slow down the speaking as speakers think about the rules before speaking and therefore, fluency is hindered. However, Rubin (1975) defines good learners as the learners monitoring their speech without fluency problem.

2.2.3 Interaction and Speaking

When individuals speak to be good communicators, the listener and speaker should want to continue their interaction (Bygate, 1987). This means they need interaction skills which are called negotiation skills and routines.

Negotiation skills are necessary for solving the problems and communicating the ideas (Bygate, 1987). According to his investigation, Long (1983) suggests that native speakers use simple vocabulary and grammar and ask for clarification when they speak with non-native speakers. Here, as interactional strategies, native speakers try to avoid conversational problems and repair the problem when there occurs any.

Also negotiation skills can help solve the problems in communication and make speakers more understood since they have close connections with managing the interaction and meaning negotiation (Bygate, 1987). Managing the interaction is a kind of agreement to define who speaks next and what to talk about. What to talk about can be explained as agenda management and it deals with the topic of conversation, its length and how to open and close it. Besides, turn taking includes the signals to start, end and switch a conversation. But, Ellis (2003) handles the negotiation from meaning and content points of

views. His determination depends on the source of problem which can be from learner or from learner's pair.

Negotiation skills also help communicate ideas clearly and convey the signals of understanding, not understanding or misunderstanding during the conversation (Bygate, 1987). One factor to ensure the understanding during the oral communication is the speaker's choice of expressions which is called as the level of explicitness; and the other factor involves the usage of vocabulary, metaphors and the paraphrases and this is called procedures of negotiation. The aim to use above mentioned communication strategies like vocabulary, metaphors and the paraphrases is to be clear and comprehensible in communication. Among the interactional strategies, Rost and Rose (1991) suggest that the discourse duration depends on response strategies and utterances may be repeated according to lexical repetition.

2.2.4 Speaking and Communicative Competence

According to Shumin (1997), there are four competence types which comprise the communicative competence. These are grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competences. Grammatical competence is called formal competence as well and there is a similarity between it and linguistic competence of Chomsky which includes the lexical, syntactic, phonological and morphological characteristics of the language of any native speaker. These features together with the capacity of the speaker help produce proper words and sentences (Shumin, 1997; Alptekin, 2002). Therefore, it can be suggested that grammatical rules and grammatical competence are essential for a speaker in a language. Without referring to any grammar book, a native English speaker can find out the sentences with wrong grammar since a native speaker knows the language's system; this knowledge is below the consciousness level and is implicit (Cook, 2013). Besides, communicative competence help people learn the ways to interact and this may encourage grammar learning as well (Hatch, 1978).

The second type of competence is sociolinguistic competence where social rules and conditions such as the social status, roles, the type and function of shared information are involved (Shumin, 1997; Alptekin, 2002). The type of language production and its quality may be affected and hindered or enhanced by social conditions.

The third type of competence is discourse competence. It deals with the capability to use the language in different contexts through combining meaningful words, utterances and

sentences and it helps people maintain conversations. And the fourth competence type is strategic competence which requires the ability to manage speaking in communicative situations and keep on communication. If the speakers know communication strategies, it can be easier to compensate and so, communicative interactions are not interrupted. Hymes (1972) suggests that just knowing a language is not enough for communication and speakers should know all the situations in which they like to be a part such as persuading, complaining, arguing, talking in a formal environment and so on.

After mentioning about the definition and theory of speaking, the anxiety and its relation with speaking and foreign language learning are discussed in the next part.

2.3 Background of Anxiety

In this part, a brief information about the anxiety, its definition, its types and its relation with foreign language learning and foreign language speaking are discussed.

2.3.1 The definition of anxiety

Although there are many affective variables investigated in FLL, anxiety may be suggested as the most interested one and one of the most difficult terms for researchers to define because of anxiety's complicated structure. Anxiety is one of the very difficult terms to be defined in a few sentences in psychology as well. In learning process, both affective and cognitive sides of the brain are suggested to be important (Gardner, 1983). Emotion as an affective factor can influence teaching efficacy. Teachers may recognize chiefly anxiety, attitudes, imagination, inhibition, extroversion, self-esteem and empathy as other affective factors in their teaching process (Brown, 1994). Researches show that anxiety has the biggest effects on learners among the other affective factors (Brown, 1994; Horwitz et al., 1986; Young, 1992).

The feeling anxiety causes some psychological and physiological symptoms such as sleep disturbances, palpitations, perspiring, trembling and tenseness (Horwitz and Young, 1991). According to May (1977), anxiety can be defined as a threat to the personality of a person because of a fear from a threatening situation. Here, May emphasizes the fact that the personality factor and anxiety are seen as a threat to an individual's personality when that person assumes a situation as dangerous.

There have been many different definitions for anxiety made by researchers, but some common factors can be observed in every definition such as feeling uneasy, apprehension,

tension and fear (Scovel, 1978; Horwitz and Young, 1991; Brown, 1994). These common factors can be suggested as negative factors. Therefore, anxiety can cause an obstacle for any type of learning because of its nature. Since these factors can be found in characteristics of individuals, people can evaluate their actions negatively and as a result of this, they can tend to fail, feel timid and avoid new tasks like having examination and doing communication activities in class (Ehrman, 1996). Sometimes an individual may feel anxious during whole learning process.

Eysenck (1970) proposed that general anxiety is originally a personality trait but anxiety can also be described by genetic-hereditary origin, which can be called trait-like anxiety, and social-oriented origin that can be called situation-specific anxiety. External stimuli can invoke sympathetic nervous systems easily in people tending to have overall anxiety which can be described with hereditary origin (Cattell, 1973). And some personality types have strong ordinary social anxiety. According to Leary and Kowalski (1995), there are five traits for the anxiety in social situations: self-consciousness, interpersonal confidence, general trait anxiety, self-esteem and approval motivation.

From these definitions, it can be suggested that anxiety has not only psychological but also physiological aspects and since learning a foreign language involves both interpersonal and social effort, the importance of affective factors should be taken into consideration in foreign language learning (Horwitz, 2000). Also anxiety and personality can be assumed as affective variables which are related to foreign language learning (Öztürk and Gürbüz, 2013). Researchers assume anxiety as a critical individual difference in learning a foreign language and have tried to identify anxiety which is a part of psychological aspects of learning (Matsuda and Gobel, 2004), since there is a negative relation between foreign language anxiety and course grades of students (Aida, 1994; Horwitz, 2001). It is not definitely known how anxiety interferes with FLL because of its multi-dimensional and complex construct (Young, 1986; Horwitz et al., 1986). However, in most foreign language researches, foreign language anxiety has been observed as a debilitating factor in many FLL areas.

Before investigating the reasons and sources of anxiety in FLL, it may be better to determine the most typical anxiety types concerning language learning environments. For this reason, the following section deals with the types of anxiety.

2.3.2 Types of Anxiety

Types of anxiety are generally classified into two by researchers. In the first classification there are three anxiety types; these are trait, state, and situation specific anxieties (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994). In the other classification there are facilitative anxiety and debilitating anxiety.

One of the anxiety types is trait anxiety. This type of anxiety is experienced more intensely and more frequently by most average people and it is almost permanent state in personality of an individual. This is rather a stable tendency to be anxious (Scovel, 1978) and to display anxiety in numerous different circumstances (Philips; 1991). Trait anxiety originates from personality characteristics. Individuals having anxiety tend to be anxious in almost every condition and in any situation (Spielberger, 1983; Gardner, 1999). This feeling of anxiety is strong and enduring and it can also be called a personality trait (Brown, 1994). People with trait anxiety tend to react almost every situation (Philips, 1992). According to these definitions, trait anxiety as a relatively stable tendency and permanent in nature, is a personality characteristic and this characteristic influences a person negatively. For example, an individual's cognitive features and memory are affected in negative ways by trait anxiety according to MacIntyre and Gardner (1991). Sometimes an individual with big trait anxiety regards some situations more threatening than they really are and because of this, s/he feels apprehension in different situations (Spielberger, 1983).

The next anxiety type is state anxiety. State anxiety is connected to the conditions in particular situations. It occurs according to situations when people feel apprehensive and excited. State anxiety can be defined as unpleasant state or condition and connected to the conditions in particular and generally relatively temporary situations. According to Brown (1994), a stimulus provokes temporarily this anxiety type. From this point of view, state anxiety may be suggested as a short-time personality feature and transitory. State anxiety is felt when a person thinks a situation or stimulant as dangerous, risky, unsafe or alarming. It is the apprehension felt at a specific time like before giving a speech, taking examination or before a presentation (Spielberger, 1983). At this specific time, anxiety may occur as a reaction to a particular situation. It is also suggested that state anxiety is a reaction caused by the circumstances in a special situation and therefore, it is not a permanent trait (Young, 1990). State anxiety is generally defined as a temporary reaction and it shows variety

according to personality and characteristics of a person. The power and continuation of state anxiety on a person may also vary according to level of danger or threat that an individual feels towards the stressful situation (Spielberger, 1972).

It is more probable for people with state anxiety to have trait anxiety as well because there is a strong parallelism between trait anxiety and state anxiety. However, state anxiety can occur under certain conditions while trait anxiety may be related to an individual's character that can cause anxiety in any situation. Therefore, higher trait anxious students have higher state anxiety than students with low trait anxiety, disregarding the test difficulty (Head et al., 1991). Nonetheless, reactions to different situations of people with same trait anxiety scores can be different. For instance, to the situations of dangerous circumstances, new situations and written exams or tests, two participants with same trait anxiety scores reacted differently. Their scores were same for new and dangerous situations. While both were anxious in written examinations, one participant became nervous in social situations but the other was not nervous in social situations (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991).

And another anxiety type is defined as situation specific anxiety (Woodrow, 2006). Conditions of a particular situation cause it (Wang, 1998). Some researchers suggest situation specific anxiety as an alternative option for the state anxiety. Situation specific anxiety can be realized in an explicit situation. The reasons may be the circumstances of a definite situation. This type of anxiety appears regularly. Sometimes a learner does not feel having adequate knowledge of language; situation specific anxiety means apprehension in such situations; so, according to language learning anxiety researches, foreign language anxiety is seen in situational anxiety category (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991). Therefore, researchers can understand the anxiety of an individual from different point of views in a specific situation. Furthermore, it is most commonly related concept to state anxiety. Situation specific anxiety is important in FLL process. Generally, situation specific anxiety is seen at times when a learner wants and tries to speak in foreign language. Some examples of situation specific anxiety can be suggested as having examinations, doing speaking activities in front of other learners, taking a test, oral examinations, composition anxiety that is defined as having negative feelings about writing tasks and library anxiety that is defined as having negative feelings in a library (Onwuegbuzie, 1997).

Besides the types of anxiety mentioned above, Alpert and Haber (1960) defined facilitating and debilitating anxieties as well.

The first one is facilitative anxiety. Anxiety does not always have negative effects on performance of individuals but it might sometimes have positive effects, especially on learning according to some psychologists. This anxiety type is facilitative anxiety which affects students positively and motivates them. Facilitating anxiety changes learners' attention from the task they are working on and so, learners' performance is positively affected. It is the interest and eagerness prior to start a difficult task.

According to Scovel (1991), facilitative anxiety has a motivating aspect and he further suggests that "facilitating anxiety motivates the learner to fight the new learning task; it gears the learner emotionally for approach behavior". From this point of view, facilitating anxiety can be suggested as having positive effects on language learning process of learners. There are a few investigations to show the positive influences of anxiety on FLL. One of them is about the language anxiety types and belongs to Kleinmann (1977). Scovel (1978) summarizes this study and asserts that learners' performance is affected positively and Arabic students desire to construct difficult linguistic structures in English. And this willingness may point to positive correlations between language learning and facilitating anxiety.

With the help of facilitative anxiety, a student might be more careful and self-assured and so, whatever they do they can do better. Facilitative anxiety can positively affect the learners when they carry out an assignment and accomplish a task (Brown, 1994). Brown also suggests that a little anxiety helps an individual maintain motivation to complete an activity.

Competitive language learning can partially be related with this motivating aspect. This fact can be seen in one of the studies of Bailey (1983) on students' diaries. According to an extended analysis of these diaries, some students compared themselves with other students and this comparison resulted in facilitative anxiety. And after their notification about their fellow students' success, they tried harder and studied more. This can be called positive competitiveness.

There are some conflicts about facilitative anxiety concept among researchers. Some suggest that anxiety has just a debilitating aspect and so, anxiety does not have anything about motivation (Ehrman, 1996). Some suggest that in easier tasks facilitative anxiety can

positively interfere a little but when the whole language learning process is taken into account, facilitative anxiety's role cannot be applied (Horwitz et al., 1986). In summary, facilitative anxiety makes a learner more careful and sharp. This is accepted as a positive factor in completing a task.

According to Krashen (Young, 1992), facilitative anxiety can help individuals positively in assignments depending on some conscious effort but anxiety is not needed at all for foreign language learning. However, Rardin suggests that a balanced anxiety to some extent in the classroom may be helpful in learning. She uses the metaphor of a driver and driving a car; to be alert is very important when a person is driving. The driver can reach the destiny as a result of this watchfulness. The same can be applied to the classroom; the learners should be watchful and ready to receive new information. However, if the driver becomes over watchful, this may cause stress, affect her/his driving negatively and at the end bring about an accident (Young, 1992). The help of some anxiety is supported by Horwitz (2001) as well. However, she suggests this for easy tasks; facilitative anxiety does not have supportive effects on complicated language assignments but it can be beneficial in easy tasks. Another researcher Scovel (1991) claims that students should be circumspect and motivated when they learn new items; so they need some facilitative anxiety.

The second one is debilitating anxiety. The term anxiety has generally negative connotations in psychology and learning, especially in FLL. For this reason, the term debilitating anxiety depicts it best. Although anxiety has positive effects on foreign language learning to some extent, it debilitates learners' FLL process according to many studies in the field. MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) confirm this negative role of anxiety and assert that debilitating effect is the most common among the other influences of anxiety in FLL and is 'detrimental to performance'. There are similar statements to those of MacIntyre and Gardner. Scovel (1991) claims that a learner does not want to perform a new task and develops an avoidance behavior because of debilitating anxiety. Opposite to facilitating anxiety, debilitating anxiety makes a learner avoid from a new learning task; automatically it gets a person to comply with avoidance behavior (Scovel, 1978). Thus, it can be easily suggested that negative influences of anxiety in process of learning a foreign language are more common than its positive effects.

People have negative feelings as a result of debilitating anxiety and these feelings prevent them from performing a task. Debilitating anxiety is claimed to harm a learner's

performance in two ways; first, directly through decreasing learner's participation to tasks and preventing from usage of the target language and second, indirectly through anxiety, self-doubt and worry (Scarcella and Oxford, 1992). Therefore, it can be claimed that language anxiety may generate unexpected inhibiting factors such as apprehension, tension and fear, and affect learners' performance negatively in classroom while the same language anxiety may produce positive performance outcomes for some other learners.

To sum up, the definition and types of anxiety are given and the characteristics of each type, their relations with each other and their effects of the process of learning a foreign language are discussed above. After general information about anxiety and its types are given above, anxiety in foreign language is discussed in the following section.

2.3.3 Foreign Language Anxiety

Foreign language anxiety is a prominent point to be taken into consideration in foreign language classrooms according to previous researches. Learners can experience any kind of anxiety during their foreign language classes without any discrimination of age, level, gender or nationality. This fact may also influence learners' progress in foreign language as well. As seen before, anxiety is an important and crucial factor in all learning types. For that reason, anxiety is complicated, multidimensional and crucial for foreign language learning as well, since there are many affective variables in foreign language learning process (Young, 1990). It is not an objective but subjective feeling of stress and dread which occurs especially during second or foreign language learning process such as listening, studying, writing and speaking (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1993). They define foreign language anxiety "as the probability of experiencing anxiety arousal in a foreign language context such as in a language classroom or when communicating in a foreign language" (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994).

2.3.3.1 Anxiety and its Effects on Foreign Language Learning

The influence of anxiety on learning has long been discussed. Some researchers (Bailey, 1983; Tucker et al., 1976) suggest that learning is influenced negatively by anxiety and so, there are fewer successful learners among anxious ones. On the other hand, some researchers (Horwitz, 2001; Scovel, 1978) suggest that anxiety has a positive influence on learning and so, a little anxiety can help learning process positively. If the types of anxiety are determined, the effects of anxiety can be understood better.

MacIntyre (1995) defines anxiety's negative influence on learners' performance as a demand to answer a question in foreign language class may cause a student to become anxious; anxiety leads to worry and rumination and so cognitive performance suffers, leading to negative self-evaluations and more self-deprecating cognition which further impairs performance and so on. Some learners build relations with anxiety and foreign language learning and this association triggers a feeling of anxiety which may hinder foreign language learning or communication for them. It can also be suggested that even some learners have negative feelings when they think of learning a foreign language. Olivares-Cuhat (2013) examined the importance of affective, cognitive and meta-cognitive variables on foreign language performance as learner variables in one of their investigations. Their findings again show that anxiety in foreign language is an important factor of FLL.

However, the investigations on language learners indicate that foreign language anxiety predicts the performance of foreign language learners best among other affective factors (Liu and Huang, 2011). It has been accepted that anxiety deters foreign language learning but how this happens cannot be explained fully. However, it is widely accepted that negative effects of anxiety overrun the positive effects. From this reality, it can be inferred that anxiety generally seems to have debilitating effects on performance of language learners in all phases of language learning. According to MacIntyre (1995), there is a negative correlation between anxiety and performance and anxiety damages the performance of learners in reading and learning tasks, listening comprehension, speaking and repetition. Therefore, this failure in performance may cause peculiar diversities between high-anxious and low-anxious learners. Accordingly, more anxious learners are expected to show poor performance in many exercises in their foreign language classes.

2.3.3.2 Foreign Language Anxiety as a Negative Feeling

The reason for foreign language anxiety can be the anxiety experienced by learners in some negative situations related to troubles they encounter in any areas of a foreign language. Because of this, they build a negative relation with their anxiety and foreign language contexts and see the foreign language as the source to be anxious. Hence, learners lean to be anxious in their foreign language classes and therefore, they do not take part in tasks to improve their language skills. Here the degree of anxiety is important since

excessive anxiety may slow down the learning and success while some degree of anxiety can be helpful for learning (Campbell and Ortiz, 1991).

That foreign language anxiety generates problems for language learners is obvious. Wörde (2003) conducted a study related to this about learners' attitudes on anxiety in FLL process. According to the findings, anxiety and performance are negatively correlated and anxiety influences language learning of students negatively and lowers motivation and language learning since foreign language learning motivation is negatively correlated with foreign language speaking; thus, the idea that learners having low anxiety may perform better than students having high anxiety is supported by some results as well (Phillips, 1991; Öztürk, 2012). Similarly, anxious students try harder in tasks than their classmates with low anxiety but their effort does not reflect itself in results maybe because they spend their energy to beat the feeling of anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986).

Sometimes people that are successful in other subjects may fail in FLL. Horwitz and Young (1991) suggest that this may be because of anxiety reaction that some people face in FLL process. It can be asserted that learners develop this anxiety reaction when they really try to make progress in target language. They may develop anxiety reaction if they feel they cannot make advancement in foreign language. Actually, it has been discussed whether poor language learning results foreign language anxiety or not. There has been a discussion on this point; it has been asserted that poor language skills cause anxiety but some others say anxiety causes poor language learning. Among the researchers, Horwitz (2001) has reached a decision that poor language learning results foreign language anxiety. According to her, foreign language learning naturally requires risk taking but this risk taking may influence learners' social image negatively. So, they worry that if they make mistakes, their social image is distorted and an improper social image appears. For this reason, learners with poor language skills may show uneasy or fearful behaviors in classroom.

Therefore, foreign language anxiety can be among the most important affective problems in foreign language classes and this problem should be understood and defined well. According to foreign language anxiety studies, language learning is not a personality trait but classified as a situational specific anxiety (Horwitz, 2001; MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991). Students may do well and have perfect grades in lessons other than language lessons but they can feel anxiety in their language classes. Highly anxious students indicate

that they forget grammar points in exams, make avoidable mistakes because they feel nervous and freeze or sweat in role plays (Horwitz et al., 1986). In language learning process, learners see themselves vulnerable in front of their class and this fact results into anxiety (Tsui, 1996).

Horwitz and his friends (1986) accepted anxiety in foreign language as a different and independent aspect and as a complex psychological phenomenon which generally happens during language learning process. Learners may have different types of anxiety but according to this definition, FLL is the main source of learners' anxiety and frustration. Another important point here is that normally those learners who do not experience anxiety may feel anxious when they learn a foreign language; so this reality differentiates foreign language anxiety from other anxiety types (Horwitz, 2001). In many researches about foreign language anxiety, this reality may indicate the menacing and debilitating influences of anxiety on language learning.

2.3.3.3 Foreign Language Anxiety Factors

Horwitz et al. (1986) suggest that FLL generally happens in academic environments such as classrooms and this constitutes the situation specific characteristic of FLA. They suggested a FLL anxiety theory based on their observational and unscientific data. According to them, their theory has three interdependent performance anxiety factors; test anxiety, fear of negative evaluation and communication apprehension. Also they claim that FLA is a specific problem resulted from this group of three anxieties. Before categorizing it, it may be good to identify and define the FLA.

According to MacIntyre and Gardner (1991), these components of anxiety have a deleterious effect on foreign language learning. These three types of performance anxieties describe the foreign language anxiety well. Fear of negative evaluation, test anxiety and communication apprehension in foreign language learning may threat one's self. Correspondingly, the feelings of reduced self-efficacy may occur and gradually a learner may see a foreign language situation as a threatening situation (Pappamihel, 2002).

Two components of anxiety, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation are discussed below. And the third component, communication apprehension which is closely related to speaking anxiety will be discussed in FLSA part.

2.3.4 Test Anxiety

Test anxiety consists of the examinations and tests during foreign language learning process. Horwitz et al. (1986) indicate that test anxiety is a performance anxiety and fear of failure triggers it. As learners can worry about having low marks and not meeting the expectations, this may increase their feeling of anxiety as well. It has been shown in research that high test anxiety correlates with less success in foreign language tests and so, high level of test anxiety can cause less success in foreign language tests (Ohata, 2005). Foreign language anxiety and its effects on oral tests were investigated in a study and similar results were found out (Phillips, 1992). The findings showed that students with high anxiety performed worse than students with low anxiety and these slightly anxious students could use more complicated structures than very anxious students.

Thus, it can be suggested that students with high test anxiety may do poorly in tests than their classmates having low test anxiety. Hodapp et al. (1995) mentions psychological effects of test anxiety and asserts that when they are in an examination situation, individuals having high test anxiety may not answer properly and freely. Generally, learners with test anxiety have some typical features; for example, they cannot concentrate and pay attention, they are disturbed by their physical tension and senses and finally, this situation may affect their performance in foreign language classes and may cause academic failure (Sena et al., 2007).

2.3.4.1 Test Anxiety and Academic Success

Language learners having lower test anxiety are academically more successful than language learners having moderate and high test anxiety. In the same vein, language learners having moderate test anxiety are academically more successful than language learners having high test anxiety (Chapell et al., 2005). Moreover, test anxiety causes academic failure through decreasing attention, concentration and irrelevant thoughts (Sansigiry and Sail, 2006).

Some kind of evaluative stress is experienced by students since they assume examination situations as threatening. It is a state of apprehension for academic evaluation. Even if students study hard, they may not be successful in a test or examination because they feel anxious as a result of test anxiety. This worry for failure may also affect students' self-perception in their academic climate. Learners with test anxiety usually want to achieve more than they can do and they are always anxious and worried about their performance

(Liu and Jackson, 2008). Students with test anxiety usually are perfectionist students and consider themselves unsuccessful if their score is lower than they want. It is also suggested that foreign language learning process, especially oral presentation is assumed not as a communication opportunity or foreign language skills development, but as a test situation by learners having test anxiety (Tsiplakides and Keramida, 2009).

Before every test or examination, learners have some expectations about their performance. If their expectations for an approaching test are negative, then this is called test anxiety (Horwitz and Young, 1991). Test anxiety can be suggested as consisting of four separate phases; the first one is test anticipation where learners evaluate and their preparation for the test, their previous knowledge, the test difficulty level and try to figure out their test outcome. After this evaluation, if they feel they will fail, then the feeling anxiety starts for them. The second phase includes the preparation for the test. The students prepare for the test because they think studying will be effective. They build bridges between their success and reaching their targets and this bridge requires only a good test achievement (Covington, 1985). And in test taking phase they feel anxiety which inhibits them and this feeling discourages them as well. And in the last, test reaction phase, they find out that their negative expectations are accomplished (Covington, 1985).

2.3.4.2 Test Anxiety and Foreign Language Anxiety

Test anxiety can be related to foreign language anxiety. According to Horwitz and Young (1991), test anxiety and FLA are in close connection because performance of students is constantly evaluated in their foreign language class. The source of test anxiety is learners' worry of being failed. Students having test anxiety assumes everything as failure except perfect test performance. As a result of this, these students have a lot of difficulties in foreign language classes because there are many tests, quizzes and exams in language learning which may provoke anxiety. Horwitz et al. (1986) also assert that students realize they give wrong answers because of anxiety, nervousness and apprehension although they know the right answer. Test anxiety also depends on whether students can manage the testing process and organize the required material and information during the test. So, students may feel anxious when they cannot arrange the information and write properly. Students with test-anxiety may approach tests negatively and as a result of these negative feelings, they may have unreal thoughts towards evaluations of the tests.

Anxiety may happen in various test types in teaching and testing procedures. For example, in a study conducted by Madsen et al. (1991), it was determined that some test types provoke more anxiety in learners than others; so, learners react differently to some specific test types. Among these test types, generally the least anxiety-provoking ones are true-false and dictation tests but the most anxiety-provoking and at the same time least favored test type is translation for the learners. Moreover, it is also suggested that when a language teacher gives different types of tests and teaches with a definite approach to language teaching, learners may find this situation anxiety-provoking and frustrating because of the new test type which they are not familiar with (Young, 1986).

Negative effects of anxiety are not seen only on learners' performance. Cognitive processing of the information in foreign language classes is also negatively affected by anxiety (MacIntyre, 1995). In sum, learners with high anxiety divide their attention while learners with low anxiety work only on relevant information. Accordingly, the quality of learners' performance is affected negatively. Yet, anxiety may develop positive influence on learners' performance in relatively simple tasks (MacIntyre, 1995).

2.3.4.3 Fear of Negative Evaluation

Further, fear of negative evaluation is attributed to worries of people about others' ideas on themselves which they assume generally negative (Horwitz and Young, 1991). Here, evaluation means not only the academic but also personal evaluation related to learners' competence and activities in the target language. That is to say, learners are afraid whether their teachers and friends evaluate them academically and personally (Noormohamadi, 2009).

Learners demand to build a positive social impression on others and this triggers the fear of negative evaluation. But in class, students should neglect their self-concept and be open to negative criticism of others. Otherwise, they may have anxiety in this situation (Tsui, 1996). So, these kind of learners are concerned more with their image among their friends in classroom and generally prefer being passive in the classroom and not to take part in activities and tasks. Besides, they see errors as sources for negative evaluations from their teachers or their friends (Tsiplakides and Keramida, 2009).

In addition, it can easily be suggested that fear of negative evaluation has broader scope than test anxiety (Horwitz and Young, 1991). The researches have showed that evaluations of teachers and students' classmates may highly affect students in foreign language classes.

They do not trust their knowledge about foreign language and they are not sure about themselves either; as a result of this, they are not sure about their sayings and their answers. They become doubtful about their skills and abilities in their language classes and so, they may think they will not be successful enough to form an appropriate social impression among their peers (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991). Students generally underestimate their abilities in their language classes, are afraid of negative evaluations when they have to answer a question or do a language task and see themselves lower than their classmates.

Sometimes people think and convince themselves that they are evaluated negatively and this fear of negative evaluation may hinder their foreign language learning process completely (Ay, 2010). While they use the language, some learners think they are evaluated through their usage. Sometimes they may assume that they do not have enough linguistic competence to carry on communication and express properly what they want. On this point, they may feel worried of being seen improperly by others and be afraid of giving a false social image about themselves. As a result of this, there are avoidance of communication and communicative activities and minimum participation to oral and speaking tasks.

A study by Gregersen and Horwitz (2002) also confirms these claims. They conducted a study on how language learners with anxiety reacted to learners without anxiety during oral performance. The findings showed that highly anxious students are afraid of negative evaluations of their peers because they thought this would make them seem foolish. Therefore, it can be suggested that learners are generally afraid of their teachers' and their classmates' feedbacks.

2.3.5 Instruments to Measure Foreign Language Anxiety

For defining and solving the problems in FLA, some instruments have been developed. The following part deals with measurement and measuring instruments of anxiety. The instruments, their developers and their features are also discussed.

It was instinctively felt by researchers that anxiety had some importance in FLL process, but some of the investigations related to language learning and achievement gave conflicting results (Chastain, 1975; Scovel, 1978). Some other investigations related motivation suggested that there were some negative correlations between language achievement and anxiety (Gardner et al., 1976; Clément et al., 1977). Among researchers,

Gardner (1985) developed an instrument in order to measure FLA. But, the term foreign language anxiety became well-known and popular after the invention of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) by Horwitz et al., (1986). To measure foreign language anxiety, Horwitz et al. (1986) developed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) during their research. This instrument is a thirty-three item scale which has been used in a lot of investigations and its reliability and validity have been proved (Aida, 1994; Cheng et al., 1999).

Horwitz et al. (1986) produced a very promising model and this model has inspired many other studies to determine how anxiety affects foreign language learning. Horwitz and Young, (1991) conducted a study where the participants were French and Spanish language learners. According to results, it was determined that learners with lower anxiety received higher grades in their courses than learners with high anxiety. Aida (1994) performed an identical study also. The participants were American students who were learning Japanese. Again in this study, calmer students got higher grades than their anxious classmates.

There are a lot of researches on foreign language anxiety. Many studies and investigations have been run in different parts of the world. Some of them can be found in the following part.

There are many types of anxiety, and after defining its characteristics, foreign language anxiety also took its place among them and was separated from other anxiety types. In different contexts and situations, possible effects of foreign language anxiety (FLA) have been investigated in various places on the world. In many studies, many investigations have been devoted to what kind of relationship there are between FLA and other constructs such as cultural values and academic success.

In north of Taiwan, an investigation was conducted by Ying (1993). The participants were senior high school students and the effect of FLA on these students' English language learning was investigated. In accordance with the aims of the investigation, some tests were given to the students and students' anxiety levels were measured. According to the results, level of students' anxiety increased a little because of a difficult test in classroom context and influenced their English competence. Besides, it was observed that facilitating anxiety did not contribute a lot to their English language competence. Also in another investigation, it is determined that Japanese learners' performance can be affected

negatively by foreign language anxiety and there is a parallelism between the increase in students' instructional level and foreign language anxiety in a way that as students' instructional level develops, foreign language anxiety becomes more crucial (Saito and Samimy, 1996).

Another investigation was conducted in Croatia by Djigunovic (2006). The participants were undergraduate EFL students at university and the influence of language anxiety on English language learning process was investigated. The anxiety and students' speaking skills were observed. According to the findings, some students had big level of language anxiety and some other students had little language anxiety. There were great differences between the two groups regarding their speaking in foreign language. One group with big level of language anxiety could not speak continuously in English and there were long pauses between their speeches. Whereas the other group with little language anxiety could give continuous speeches without long pauses.

Hence, it is obvious that anxiety stems from various sources and has negative effects on learners during language learning process. Any situation may be anxiety-provoking for learners and this also influences their performance in language tasks. Foreign language anxiety generally refers to foreign language speaking anxiety since speaking provokes more anxiety than other language skills. The next part deals with FLSA from this point of view.

2.3.6 Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety

The huge research on foreign language anxiety indicates that speaking and other oral activities in foreign language learning provoke more anxiety than listening, reading and writing, and is the most questionable one. Many researches and authorities have agreed upon the fact that anxiety has negative effects on speaking and these negative effects are crucial (Phillips, 1992; MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994; Kitano, 2001; Horwitz, 2001; Matsuda and Gobel, 2004; Woodrow, 2006; Öztürk and Gürbüz, 2014) and anxiety in foreign language may influence learners' achievement (Capan and Simsek, 2012).

In foreign language teaching field, the studies and investigations among foreign language learning and the willingness to speak in target language with personality traits have been growing (Lalonde and Gardner, 1984; MacIntyre, and Charos, 1996; Shimizu, 1999; O'Connor and Paunonen, 2007; Apple, 2011). Personality of a learner determines the rate and inclination of her/his L2 use (Ehrman, 1990; Ehrman, and Oxford, 1990).

Speaking and other oral activities in foreign language learning are in close connection with communication apprehension which is also another component of foreign language learning anxiety theory.

2.3.6.1 Communication Apprehension and Anxiety

Communication apprehension can arise in any type of communication among individuals. It involves receiver anxiety when a person learns from or listens to a spoken message or stage fright when a person has to speak publicly or oral communication anxiety when a person has to speak with peers or in a group. It can be suggested that people feel anxiety in communication because they cannot completely take the control of situation. From this point of view, it can also be asserted that people suffering from oral communication anxiety will probably suffer from speaking anxiety in their foreign language classes as well. Because of the lack of necessary equipment for communicating in language classes, communication apprehension can constitute an important aspect of foreign language anxiety. Communication apprehension also differs from other anxiety types since it seems to occur more often in foreign language learning.

Communication apprehension is also the uneasiness that learners experience in oral communication and in their foreign language classes. Because they cannot communicate, learners feel a kind of apprehension and frustration when they have to speak. Some possible sources of communication apprehension have been suggested by researchers. Learners having communication apprehension feels apprehension and frustration and negative affective feelings toward the foreign language (Hilleson, 1996) because they cannot comprehend other people or express themselves (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991). And communication apprehension appears in a foreign language class as unwillingness of students to communicate in any context or as “giving a speech or conversing in a foreign language” (Foss and Reitzel, 1988). One source of anxiety for students is self-perception about their speaking. Some students may prefer not to speak since not to speak is regarded as more valuable than poor communication (Foss and Reitzel, 1988). This low ability self-perception decreases the motivation of students and hinders the improvement in their skill levels.

People with communication apprehension cannot understand other people and express themselves to others. Especially when listening and speaking skills are taken into consideration, learners with communication apprehension do not feel themselves relaxed in

foreign language contexts (Tsiplakides and Keramida, 2009). Noormohamadi (2009) asserts that communication apprehension has a metacognitive awareness that is accepted as a unique component. An individual's incompetence to appropriately express her/his sophisticated ideas and thoughts causes communication apprehension. It is one's awareness that s/he will not understand others and make herself/himself understood. This may be suggested as a reason why a lot of talkative people are silent in learning atmosphere. According to this awareness, listeners and speakers are not capable of comprehending the message in foreign language fully and completely. Because they cannot understand the message in communication process, learners are worried and there is apprehension dominating the communication process.

After describing communication apprehension and its reasons and characteristics, speaking and oral communication and their relations with anxiety are discussed below.

There are four main skills in language learning and among them speaking can be suggested as the most productive one. Many ways exist to improve this speaking skill in current language classrooms. Some of these ways can be the oral performance of students in front of the class, participation in discussions and oral presentations. Sometimes language teachers urge students to speak in English. Sometimes these speaking tasks can be very demanding for students and these demanding tasks may have negative effects on students.

Foreign language learners generally complain about speaking in target language and remark that this is the most anxiety producing task in their foreign language classrooms. Therefore, it can be suggested that speaking causes the highest level of anxiety among all skills and it is the most anxiety raising skill in foreign language classes. Speaking activities without preparation in front of their class makes learners the most anxious (Young, 1990). Speaking causes more anxiety than other language skills for language learners.

Oral communication in foreign language may be one of the most anxiety-provoking situations and therefore, language learning context with speaking tasks and activities may include anxiety raising situations for some learners (Horwitz et al., 1986). So, learners may have some negative feelings during oral communication because their performance is assessed according to some criteria they are not acquainted with enough. As a result, learners may face some problems such as not having enough determination to communicate in foreign language, unwillingness to take risks to speak and feeling of inability.

In sum, communication apprehension is closely related to FLSA. In foreign language learning contexts even talkative learners can become silent. The reasons for communication apprehension are discussed below.

2.3.6.2 Reasons of Communication Apprehension

When an individual worries about oral communication either in native or in foreign language, communication apprehension occurs (Horwitz and Young, 1991). Several personality traits like reticence, quietness or shyness are basic reasons for communication apprehension. A more detailed explanation for the reasons of communication apprehension is made by Daly (1991). First of all, communication apprehension may occur because of a person's genetic background. Second, communication apprehension can be prevented through positive reinforcement of communication behaviors since positive reinforcement for people's communication behaviors may increase their willingness to communicate (Aydın, 1999).

Communication apprehension can result from negative communication experiences of a person's early childhood. If children permanently confront negative reactions when they try to use target language, they can develop apprehensive behaviors towards speaking in target language. This is also supported by a research showing that children discouraged from communication are more inclined to be apprehensive (Daly, 1991). This is also examined from a behaviorist perspective for language learning (Tanveer, 2007). According to Tanveer (2007), teachers should approach students' errors positively, since students' fear of making mistakes may be provoked, if teachers approach their errors negatively and thus, students' attempts to communicate are obstructed.

After the reasons for communication apprehension, there may be a lot of reasons for FLSA as well. The followings can be mentioned as the most common reasons of FLSA.

2.3.6.3 Reasons of Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety

According to Wilson (2006), speaking or oral communication in foreign language causes anxiety in FLL. This means that, most of the learners are afraid of using the target language orally and so, they suffer from FLSA. Although both are productive skills, speaking differs from writing in discourse patterns, lexical and grammatical ways. Very simply, it can be suggested that speaking is an interactive and a productive skill (Carter and Nunan, 2002).

Levelt (1989) developed an information processing model happening in brain during speaking process. There are four stages in this process. The first is pre-speaking stage where the speech is designed. In this conceptualization stage, the conditions and background knowledge are involved here. In formulation stage, speaker finds proper linguistic forms such as words and phrases and matches them with grammatical markers such as auxiliaries, articles, affixes. In articulation stage, speaker uses her/his articulatory organs to produce every word. And in the last self-monitoring stage, speaker self-monitors herself/himself, checks her/his speech and makes corrections if necessary. This process happens so quickly that speaker cannot control all stages. Since this control is not possible, speaker should gain automaticity to successfully complete all these stages. Foreign language speakers may have difficulties in each stage without enough automaticity in foreign language learning (Carter and Nunan, 2002). In another study among students from different departments in the USA, it is determined that speaking classes can be the source of difficulties in learning. According to the findings, students feel anxious because they do not have enough automaticity in using the target language in their lessons, and this seems as the main source of difficulty in learning for them (Huang, 1998).

Shumin (1997) also suggests that communicative competence should be developed before speaking a foreign language effectively and that if the elements of communicative competence are analyzed, learners may find out the difficult components of speaking in target language as well. Communicative competence is a complex process; this is a reason of the difficulty for speaking in foreign language because communicative competence includes some other competences also such as strategic competence, socio-linguistic competence, discourse competence and grammatical competence.

When a learner becomes competent in certain grammatical elements like vocabulary, mechanics, syntax and morphology, this is called grammatical competence (Shumin, 1997). Grammatical competence is related to foreign language speaking anxiety because stress patterns, intonation, pronunciation and the sounds of a language are related to mechanics in speaking (Scarcella and Oxford, 1992). Lack of grammatical competence may cause interruption in speech and therefore speaker may feel anxious. Grammatical competence is important because it contributes to the development of other competences.

When a speaker knows how to transmit a message coherently, this is termed as discourse competence (Brown, 1994). In a typical everyday conversation, a speaker may talk about

present, future or past time, explain the reasons or causes of something or compare things with each other. To make a coherent conversation, ideas, words and sentences should be connected in meaningful and logical ways. And to make these connections, a speaker should have knowledge of different discourse markers (Shumin, 1997).

Socio-linguistic competence requires learners to have the ability to use the appropriate language according to the social contexts they speak. The elements of socio-linguistic competence can be determined in accordance with the intimacy of the speakers (boss-employee or director-officer), why they communicate and what they already know about each other (Brown, 1994). When a speaker cannot decide the appropriate language to use, they may feel anxious and this may affect their speaking ability in foreign language as well.

According to Brown (1994), learners should also have the knowledge of strategic competence to carry on communication even they have some deficiencies. In other words, speakers sometimes may face difficulties in expressing ideas and they had better be aware of some definite strategies and know how to use them in these difficult times. With the help of these strategies, speakers may become effective and successful communicators. In opposite side, if speakers are not aware of these strategies, they may feel embarrassed and cannot maintain the communication and as a result, this can cause a feeling of anxiety. Speaking features are also among the reasons of speaking anxiety. The speaking process should be completed in a limited time during the conversation and in this case making mistakes while speaking becomes more probable. Sometimes speakers fail in self-monitoring stage and cannot correct their mistakes. While a speaker is making mistakes during the speech, the message cannot be understood by the listener and communication problem occurs (Bozatlı, 2003). As a result of the break in the communication, speaker can feel more anxiety.

Speaking has a listening side as well and this listening side may cause some difficulty. In a speech, interlocutors become speakers and listeners in turn since speaking is a reciprocal skill (Feng, 2007). The meaning should be negotiated in a speech. However, sometimes a speaker and a listener cannot negotiate meaning because the listener cannot understand the speaker's sayings. Thus, anxiety for listener may increase and s/he may not speak to avoid misunderstanding when it is her/his turn in listening. Communicative competence can be asserted as complex because it requires speaking features and four different types of

competence from language learners. Because of this complexity, language learners may face difficulties and feel anxiety while speaking.

According to Tanveer (2007), one of the reasons of speaking anxiety is lack of adequate linguistic knowledge. He includes some linguistic and psychological factors and defines speaking anxiety thoroughly. Language learning process is so complex that all of the necessary linguistic forms have to be learned effectively by learners. Learners' deficiencies in grammatical competence can be observed in their communicative competence. This means that while learning the linguistic forms, the learners may face some difficulties which may cause speaking anxiety for them. The messages can be misunderstood and language learners can make mistakes in oral communication as a result of poor linguistic knowledge. When learners misunderstand or make mistakes, they can expect negative evaluations from their friends or teachers and so, they may feel anxious (Tanveer, 2007).

Tanveer (2007) looks at the speaking anxiety from psychological viewpoint as well. He asserts that learners have limited capacity of information processing and output. In other words, learners cannot process large amount of information once fairly well enough (Lighthown and Spada, 2006). As specified earlier, the production of speech happens at certain stages in an individual's brain. Speakers may have problems in any of these stages during oral communication and so, they may be confused and feel anxious as a result of this frustration (Tanveer, 2007).

Besides the reasons for foreign language speaking anxiety discussed above, Young (1991a) suggests some more reasons which are connected to learners, teachers or instructional practice.

2.3.6.4 Reasons of FLSA Connected to Learners, Teachers or Instructional Practice

There are some personal reasons of anxiety such as low self-esteem and competitiveness. Beside of these, learners compare themselves and their abilities with other learners. Learners generally evaluate their capacities and capabilities positively or negatively. It was proved that negative evaluations result in anxiety (Price, 1991; Aydın, 2008). On the contrary, positive evaluation may improve their language skills (MacIntyre et al., 1997). When speaking is taken into consideration, learners assess their speaking ability. And this assessment and the perception are among the most important anxiety-provoking factors (Kitano, 2001).

Among the investigations about learners' foreign language speaking anxiety, Price (1991) conducted a qualitative investigation and interviewed the participants about foreign language anxiety problem, but this time from participants' perspective. The aim of the research was to observe foreign language students with high level of anxiety during language learning process. The participants were 15 students with high anxiety at a university. It was about students' speaking in front of their friends in the lessons. The findings showed that the students were not interested in practicing foreign language but they were more worried about their mistakes in pronunciation and being mocked by their friends and laughed at because they felt more anxious in this activity. Participants were feeling anxious because they thought they did not have necessary language aptitude. As a result of this, their class performances were not satisfying them, either. Thus, anxious students have great difficulty in having communicative competence. From this point of view, this study shows parallelism with other studies where the most anxiety provoking feature in FLL is speaking.

Competence and language speaking anxiety were also investigated in another study (MacIntyre et al., 1997). The study consisted of a can-do test including French listening, reading, writing and speaking tasks and a language anxiety scale. The participants completed the scale and did the tasks. Three bilingual judges evaluated their performances. According to the results, the performance of highly anxious participants was poor on the tasks. These anxious participants evaluated their competence negatively.

Kitano (2001) did a similar investigation as well. In this study, Kitano examined FLSA and fear of negative evaluation on students and tried to find out the reasons for speaking anxiety through Foreign Language Anxiety Scale. The participants were 212 students who were taking Japanese courses at two universities in USA. The investigator improved Self Rating Can-do Scales to measure the self-perceived speaking ability of the participants. According to the results, less anxious participants had high self-perceived speaking ability.

When comparison happens among students, this competitiveness provokes anxiety. This hypothesis is also supported by an investigation of Bailey (1983). The competitiveness may increase students' language anxiety especially when these students underestimate and regard themselves less proficient than other students whom they make comparison (Bailey, 1983). When students regard their classmates more successful in completing a language

task, they feel more anxious. Anxiety may ignite competitiveness in learning a new language.

Sometimes learners compare themselves with others in classroom. This self-comparison may lead competitive behaviors for learners. The competition starts when learners recognize their foreign language skills are weaker than some other learners in their classroom. As a result of this, they may feel anxious. An investigation was conducted on this competitiveness concept. It was an interview study to determine the speaking anxiety on FLL. So, 12 main similarities with language speaking anxiety were found by the researchers. And out of these 12 similarities, one was determined as learners' comparing themselves with their classmates. It was seen that most of the participants were making comparison between their language abilities and their classmates. These participants thought their classmates were better in language skills, more fluent but they themselves were nervous and anxious (Yan and Horwitz, 2008).

According to the findings, learners compete not only with other learners but with themselves and their own performance as well. This fact can be asserted as a reason for feeling anxious for them also. In a study, the relation between this competition type and FLSA was investigated (Gregersen and Horwitz, 2002). It was an interview study and the aim was to examine the relation between language speaking anxiety and perfectionism. For this purpose, a group of totally 8 Spanish students, 4 anxious and 4 non-anxious were selected. It was a two-stage study. They answered five simple English conversational questions and were videotaped in the first stage. After one week in the second stage, they watched their recordings and criticized their interviews in Spanish. According to the findings, all perfectionists appeared to be among highly anxious learners who were afraid of negative evaluation. It was obvious that their friends' impressions about them were very important as well. As for the errors, all of the anxious students were sorry after realizing their errors, whereas less anxious students were relaxed while they were speaking and evaluating their performance.

It is suggested that FLA and FLSA are relevant to each other. Some particular skills may be assumed more important than other skills in foreign language learning by some learners. Reading is more important for some learners but grammar is more important than pronunciation for others (Ohata, 2005). Besides, unrealistic ideas of learners about foreign language learning may affect their achievement negatively (Aydın, 1999). Learners may

feel anxious when their beliefs do not correspond with real situations (Ohata, 2005) and when they are afraid of mispronunciation, being asked immediate questions, making mistakes and being negatively evaluated (Öztürk and Gürbüz, 2014).

According to researches, learners may have various beliefs in foreign language learning. Wang (1998) conducted a study about Chinese learners' and their assumptions on FLL. According to results, English has medium difficulty and it is not very difficult to learn English for most participants; aptitude in foreign language learning is important for most participants but they believed that they did not have enough aptitude; and again, most participants believed that English can be learned better in an English speaking country.

Again according to researches, learners' beliefs are more important for learners than their actual ability foreign language learning. Learners may have some unrealistic beliefs like "they should be fluent in two years" (Young, 1986). But reality is quite different from these unrealistic beliefs and therefore such unrealistic beliefs psychologically affect learners and as a result, they become disappointed, stressed and anxious. As they study a foreign language, learners realize what they know about language learning is actually different from what language learning needs. The findings of Cheng (2001) support this point. The relationship between speaking anxiety and learners' giftedness and self-efficacy beliefs was investigated in a research (Cheng, 2001). According to the results, self-efficacy has an important place in learners' language anxiety and giftedness belief in language learning has a harmful effect on language learning, chiefly among learners with low self-efficacy. It was also found that successful language learners were believed to be gifted by learners with high anxiety and low self-efficacy. The reason for this may be the fact that learners with high anxiety underestimated their abilities and capabilities and assumed that they could not learn and be successful in a foreign language unless they were gifted. Therefore, what learners believe about their self-efficacy and aptitude for foreign language learning has a great importance on their attitudes towards language learning. In another investigation, Tsai (2013) investigated the relation between English self-efficacy and English class anxiety and found a strong negative relation among these variables.

Similarly, Horwitz (1989) also conducted a study on language learning beliefs. The participants were 241 university students. According to findings, learning a foreign language meant just translating something from English for more than 60% of the Spanish and German participants and becoming fluent in a foreign language in two years or less

was possible for 40% of the participants. Here it can be observed that the clash of language learning expectations and language classroom reality leads to anxiety in language learning contexts.

Teachers may also contribute to the level of anxiety of learners according to studies about the effects of teachers on FLSA and FLA. Teachers may promote anxiety through their attitudes towards students and their methods of error correction. Errors are unavoidable and to some extent essential part of foreign language learning process. Positive or negative feedback and the amount of feedback affect the motivation and self-efficacy of foreign language learners (Williams and Burden, 1997; Aydın; 1999). For this reason, how a teacher approaches learners' errors and deals with them is important.

Learners' attitudes towards learning and speaking of a foreign language may also be shaped by their instructors. So, another reason for speaking anxiety in language classes can be teachers' manner and instructor beliefs about language teaching. Learners see the foreign language they study from their teachers' point of view. As a result of this, teachers' attitudes towards foreign language teaching are important because learners may feel anxious because of their teachers' constant corrections in class and not able to do pair work as their language teacher is afraid of losing control in the class (Young, 1986). As seen in this example, teachers' attitudes and manners about second language instruction determines the anxiety level of students.

Another possible source of language anxiety may be teacher-student relations (Koch and Terrel, 1991; Horwitz, 1989). This source is connected to the anxiety students feel when their language teacher corrects their mistakes in front of their classmates. In reality, students do not oppose error correction by their teacher, but they are more interested in how often errors are corrected, when and how errors are corrected and their teachers' manner of error correction (Young, 1986). Therefore, anxiety level of students in speaking and the quality of their relation with their language teacher depends mostly on teachers' teaching styles and error correction techniques.

It has been observed that the manner of teachers in error correction can trigger the anxiety if this manner is harsh towards students' errors. Even sometimes teacher does not need to be harsh but just interrupt a student to correct mistakes during speech. For example, one of the major anxiety provoking factors of English language students in Turkey is teachers' interruption during their speeches to correct or comment on their mistakes (Aydın, 1999).

According to Cheng (2005), there are other manners and attitudes of teachers to be anxiety provoking for students besides error correction. In a study, foreign language teachers' manners and characteristics and FLSA were investigated. Findings indicated that students found teachers that gave them unexpected quizzes were anxiety provoking. Though, students felt less anxiety with foreign language teachers with more humanistic approach towards them and were patient and relaxed with and friendly towards them. Besides, they described anxiety provoking teacher characteristics as being rigid, unpredictable and poor communicator.

Besides being rigid, unpredictable and poor communicator, praising may also cause speaking anxiety in foreign language classroom, if some students try but their efforts are ignored by their teachers and if only successful students are praised in foreign language lessons (Aydin, 1999). In another study, the effects of friends and teachers on FLSA were investigated. According to the findings, negative attitudes of teachers and peers in foreign language lessons increased the level of anxiety (Bekleyen, 2004).

Here classroom procedures can be suggested as another source of anxiety as well (Young, 1986). It is obvious that when students have to speak in English in front of their friends or a group of students they feel anxious. In their study, Mejias et al. (1991) observed that students experienced high anxiety when they spoke in front of an audience. One of the investigations of Young (1990) on students' attitudes about anxiety and speaking supports this claim. The findings showed that speaking in front of the class triggered anxiety and frustration in more than sixty-eight percent of students.

In speaking classes, students do not speak in foreign language by themselves at their desks but rather they are involved in various oral activities such as classroom presentations, pair or group work and role play in front of their peers. Generally, these oral activities require students to perform in front of their teachers and friends. According to researches, students find giving presentations in front of their peers anxiety provoking and they are more anxious if they have to participate in oral activities at blackboard more (Young, 1986; Aydin, 1999; Woodrow, 2006). As for the major reason of anxiety in making presentations, students indicated the fear of negative evaluation and being conspicuousness (Cheng, 2005). According to results, the main anxiety provoking factor was speaking at the blackboard.

There are other anxiety provoking situations besides oral activities in language classrooms. One of them also involves language teachers. Learners feel anxious when their teachers address and call on them. In a study, the participants indicated that they did not want to be addressed by their teacher directly (Von Worde, 2003). In another study, the possible activities and techniques to lower the anxiety in classroom were investigated. The findings showed that participants felt more calm and easy in pair and group work tasks and they did not like being chosen by their teachers (Koch and Terell, 1991). So, it can be suggested that anxiety in oral activities involve all anxious students but in various ways. Some students may feel anxious because they cannot speak in their foreign language lessons at all. And some may be anxious because they cannot speak fluently.

2.3.7 Resolutions and Strategies for Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety

All the identified negative effects and sources of anxiety have urged researchers to try to define resolutions and strategies to reduce the speaking anxiety level language classes and increase the motivation level of the learners. Strategies have been suggested to lower negative feelings and develop positive attitudes towards foreign language speaking. Teachers can teach their students the ways to overwhelm the anxiety and/or they can provide less stressful learning environment for their students (Horwitz and Young, 1991). But changing foreign language learning context is a difficult task, so generally students are suggested some anxiety-coping strategies and non-threatening classroom atmosphere can be provided for the students in order to overwhelm anxiety.

It is seen in common reasons of anxiety part that students may have personal beliefs which usually do not reflect the real picture about language learning. Therefore, if students define their fears and beliefs, they may evaluate their anxiety more realistically (Foss and Reitzel, 1988). And as a result of this, they may deal with anxiety-provoking situation rather than avoiding it.

Teachers may lower students' anxiety if they provide a relaxed and friendly atmosphere in their language classes (Crookall and Oxford, 1991). According to the authors, teachers should reward efforts of their students, their risk-taking and success at oral communication and be temperate and friendly. In order to have a positive atmosphere in the classroom, some activities such as pair and group works, structured exercises, simulations and games can be used. Through these humanistic atmospheres, students may have the chance to express themselves freely, have realistic expectations about language learning and being

less competitive towards their peers. And as a result of this non-threatening climate, they may perform better and have less anxiety in class.

Teachers' manners are mentioned as one of the reasons of anxiety for students. In order to eliminate this, teachers should see themselves not as a drill sergeant of Audio Lingual Method but as a foreign language teacher in a learner-centered classroom environment (Young, 1986). Communicative approaches see language teachers as facilitators who make environment suitable to communicate more with enough and proper input with many opportunities to speak and with authentic materials with real life situations for their students. At the same time, language teachers should not forget that their attitudes in class reflect their beliefs on language teaching; so they should scrutinize their beliefs on language teaching and try to get rid of the ones which can negatively affect their students.

Instructor-learner relations are also mentioned as one of the reasons of anxiety for students. In order to eliminate this, teachers should revise their attitudes and approach on error correction in language classes carefully (Young, 1986). Teachers have the role of reducing the anxiety of their students as well. In one of the studies of Price (1991), participants with high anxiety give some recommendations to handle their anxieties. They indicate that teachers should give more positive reinforcement, tolerate their mistakes, encourage them to have more realistic expectations and also make students understand that they cannot be fluent in a short time. With teacher having these characteristics and attitudes, students can fight with the disabling effects of speaking anxiety because they have a relaxed and comfortable classroom atmosphere.

Games, pair work and activities for the needs of learners can be suggested to teachers when the anxiety occurs because of classroom procedures (Young, 1986). Activities can play an important role to decrease anxiety in classroom. Koch and Terrell (1991) investigated the level of anxiety in students in groups or pairs. According to the results, investigators suggest the usage of activities belonging to the Natural Approach instead of memorization, drills and dialogue recitation. They suggest that these activities may cause students to have negative attitudes towards foreign language. Also, they assert that Natural Approach activities may reduce students' affective filter and reduce their inhibitions.

However, although students indicate that being and speaking in front of their friends is the most anxiety-raising situation for them, some activities make this necessary. Oral interpretation activity is suggested for students to overwhelm their speaking anxiety (Foss

and Reitzel, 1988). Here, students first read and make practice in small groups and then they read it in front of their friends. In order to eliminate language testing anxieties, fair tests can be developed and used. If teachers give test to their students with the subjects not taught in the class, students may feel anxious. Some tests are more anxiety-provoking than some others (Madsen et al., 1991).

In sum, there are many reasons for FLSA and some of them are discussed above. When all these reasons are taken into consideration, it seems that personality traits may function as determiners of an individual's level of FLSA. There have been many studies on foreign language speaking anxiety. The following part included some of these studies from different contexts.

Researches on foreign language speaking anxiety are also in abundance. Sometimes students' friends and instructors have control over their production to some extent, and this can lead communication apprehension for students in foreign language learning environments as well (Horwitz and Young, 1991). Tanveer (2007) investigated the possible factors for communication apprehension in his interview study about the reasons for language anxiety in speaking. According to the findings, the participants felt anxiety because of the competitive atmosphere in the classroom or instructor's insistence on this competitive atmosphere.

Ohata (2005) investigated the possible reasons for anxiety of English learners in Japan. The result showed that fear of negative evaluation was experienced by whole class. Beside of this, interviews were conducted with three undergraduate students from Art, Journalism and Computer Science departments and two graduate students from Adult Communication and English departments. In these interviews, the participants commented primarily on classroom atmosphere and how this classroom atmosphere affected them negatively. Three participants expressed they felt extreme stress when they were making presentations in front of the class and other two participants expressed their hearts were pounding and they were sweating when they were giving answers to the questions in class.

Speaking is the first skill to remember when the term foreign language anxiety is used. Speaking is closely associated with foreign language anxiety. Debilitating effect of FLA on students' speaking performance was investigated by Woodrow (2006) in Australia. The participants were 275 university students. According to the findings, oral achievement was significantly predicted by lower levels of FLA, communication with native speakers

caused the most FLA. This study showed another important finding; more anxious language learners were coming from Confucian heritage cultures (CHCs) such as Japan, Korea and China. These learners were more anxious than learners from other ethnic groups in language learning. Therefore, it can be asserted that culture may be one factor to affect learners' FLA level.

Woodrow (2006) investigated speaking performance of learners and FLA and asserted foreign language speaking anxiety as an important predictor of success and mentioned about the existence of powerful negative relationship between oral performance and foreign language speaking anxiety. These findings show that students' speaking in English and their oral communication skills may be adversely affected by anxiety. This means anxiety has a strong influence on successful communication. Moreover, almost all participants emphasize that giving oral presentations is the highest anxiety-provoking task for them. It has also been determined that group discussion is the least anxiety-provoking task; so it can be suggested that collaborative techniques which support interaction among students can be beneficial in language classes (Woodrow, 2006).

Some classroom activities may be directly related to students' performance and their anxiety in speaking. According to Hilleson (1996), role-play may be a good alternative in language classes since students feel comfortable in role-play activities. This result contradicts with what Young (1990) and Koch and Terrell (1991) have found out; students in their studies indicated that role-play and skits were the most anxiety-provoking activities. Still some activities to reduce anxiety have been suggested such as using conversation strategies in class, pair-group work, role-play and cooperative learning activities which provide less threatening atmosphere for oral activities and help reducing speaking anxiety of students' (Phillips, 1991). Through these activities, students may know each other better and have a sense of community. As everybody in the class may make mistakes, they feel less embarrassed.

There is another study about students' speaking anxiety by Koch and Terrell (1991). According to their findings, activities of the Natural Approach like giving the definitions of words, role-playing, oral presentations etc. cause the most anxiety in foreign language classroom. Another investigation on relations between writing anxiety and classroom anxiety was conducted by Cheng et al. (1999). They also investigated their relations with writing and speaking achievement. According to the results, there is strong anxiety

component in general language classroom anxiety. This may prove that instruments to measure language anxiety generally measure speaking anxiety in foreign language. Usually anxious students do not want to participate oral activities because their sounds distort, they cannot produce intonation and rhythm of the language, remember words and phrases, they freeze on the time of performance and so, they prefer remaining silent and avoiding participation to the tasks (Young, 1986).

Another investigation on relations between FLL motivation and speaking anxiety was conducted in Taiwan where the participants were non-native EFL university students. According to the findings, students were determined as having high level of speaking anxiety (Huang, 2004). In another study, Liu and Jackson (2008) made a research among 547 Chinese EFL students. They also indicated in this study that students experienced high speaking anxiety and in foreign language classes, foreign language speaking anxiety was an influential predictor of unwillingness to communicate. In another study, fifteen 3rd grade students at ages 13-14 in Greece were analyzed qualitatively (Tsiplakides and Keramida, 2009). The researchers indicated that six out of these fifteen students had English language speaking anxiety because they were afraid of negative assessment from their friends and because they thought they had lower ability in speaking than their friends.

McCroskey (1977) pioneered not only for the conception of Willingness to Communicate (WTC), but also for the conception of Communication Apprehension (CA) as well. McCroskey's investigation mainly concerned native speakers of English in USA (i.e. L1 speakers in an L1 context), but his work had a great influence on speaking anxiety and confidence researches in FLA, especially for Clément, Baker and MacIntyre (2003).

In his study of foreign language communication MacIntyre investigated how anxiety and perceived self-efficacy influenced Willingness to Communicate (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996). Later, anxiety was not seen as a separate form but added into foreign language self-confidence concept. In the studies on Willingness to Communicate (WTC), the term foreign language self-confidence or foreign language communication confidence were used. Indeed, various terms like perceived competence, self-efficacy, perceived self-confidence and apprehension exist as either synonymous terms or completing terms for each other.

Certain variable factors like time of start for learning English, motivation and gender have also been investigated as other possible factors affecting foreign language speaking anxiety

of students (Dalkılıç, 2001; Huang, 2004; Wilson, 2006; Batumlu and Erden, 2007). Among these studies, only Huang's (2004) study did not examine the above-mentioned variables for completely FLA. Instead, FLSA and its relation with learning motivation were investigated in Huang's study, in Taiwan. In the study, gender and FLSA relations and learners' willingness to study after class and their time of start for learning English were also included. The Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety Scale was applied to 502 participants who were learning English at a university. According to the results, the level of anxiety of female participants was higher than male participants and early English starters were less anxious than late starters. Further, learners who did not have willingness to study after class had more anxiety than learners who had willingness to study after class.

In Spain, an investigation was conducted at a university and 40 English language learners participated. Certain factors such as time of start for learning English, age, gender and their relations between FLA were investigated (Wilson, 2006). The findings were similar to results of Huang's (2004); male participants were less anxious than females. Nevertheless, in terms of learners' time of start for learning English and their age, no significant difference was determined.

In addition to the studies above, there have been investigations about the relationship between learners' performance, achievement and proficiency level and foreign language anxiety as well (MacIntyre et al., 1997; Dalkılıç, 2001; Batumlu and Erden, 2007; Liu, 2006; Woodrow, 2006; Şakrak, 2009; Llinas and Garau, 2009). No significance was determined between learners' performance, achievement and proficiency level and their foreign language anxiety in many of these studies. Most of their results suggested that learners' performance, achievement and proficiency level and their foreign language anxiety were negatively correlated. In Turkey, a similar investigation was conducted. The participants were prep school students but their proficiency levels were different. The achievement of students and their FLA were investigated. Students' average scores of their two mid-term exams were correlated with their FLA. The findings showed that successful students had low FLA, but learners with lower success level had high foreign language anxiety (Salim, 2004; Batumlu and Erden, 2007; Şakrak, 2009). Also a high negative correlation was detected between anxiety and self-confidence (Kaya, 1995).

Another study about foreign language proficiency and FLA was conducted in Turkey with university students (Dalkılıç, 2001). The participants were ELT freshmen. The Foreign

Language Classroom Anxiety Scale and the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency were the instruments used in the study. According to the results, low proficiency level correlated with high foreign language anxiety level, so students having high levels of FLA felt less proficient. These results were identical to one of the studies conducted in Turkey; Şakrak (2009), Batumlu and Erden (2007) and Salim 2004 also had similar results about the relations between foreign language achievement and FLA.

In a similar investigation in China, the context was EFL and students' proficiency levels and their foreign language anxiety were investigated (Liu, 2006). Liu used interviews, reflective journals, observations and survey methods through triangulation of these methods. 117 female and 430 male freshmen studying English listening and speaking course were the participants. The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale was applied to determine the level of anxiety. In addition to this scale, some qualitative methods were also applied such as observation and recording. For one semester, the participants were observed and recorded in various activities in class by their teachers. Participants weekly wrote their experiences in lessons in their reflective journals. Besides, in order to analyze anxiety more detailed, some participants were interviewed. The findings indicated that most of the participants were anxious while speaking English in lessons. This result is similar to the results of investigations of Dalkılıç (2001), Şakrak (2009), Batumlu and Erden (2007) where they found out that high proficient students felt less anxiety in the class.

A similar study was conducted by Woodrow (2006). Students' speaking anxiety and their oral performances were examined. An oral exam similar to IELTS was given to participants and participants were evaluated according to pronunciation, language use and fluency. According to the results, students with low second language speaking anxiety level achieved better in oral exam and students with high second language speaking anxiety level achieved worse. Although this study is about second language speaking performance and speaking anxiety, the results of investigations about the relationship between foreign language proficiency and achievement and foreign language anxiety can be associated with it as high anxiety level showed negative effect on performance.

In addition to the studies mentioned above, a different study was also conducted among Spanish learners (Llinas and Garau, 2009). In this study, foreign language anxiety and its effects on Spanish learners were investigated at beginner, intermediate and advanced

proficiency levels. 134 students were chosen from a university in the USA for the study and these students were taking Spanish courses. Data were collected through The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). Surprisingly, it was found out that beginner participants felt less anxiety while advanced levels felt high anxiety. Advanced level participants had higher grades in their courses than other participants, although they were seen as the most anxious students. This result could be due the motivation of advanced level students, since the purpose of learning Spanish for advanced level students was to work with Spanish people. So, Spanish had to be learned by them for occupational reasons. Accordingly, the reason for learning Spanish for them was different from those students who had to take the language course just for graduation and for this reason, they felt more tension and anxiety.

There have been some investigations in Turkish contexts on FLL and FLSA besides how they affect learners in their learning process. In one of the studies, it was reported by advanced level participants that they felt anxiety in productive skills. It was also indicated that the necessity to speak without preparation made the participants anxious most (Ay, 2010). In another study, among 126 freshmen at a university Dalkılıç (2001) conducted a study about the relation between students' success at speaking course and their FLA levels. A significant relationship between learners' achievement in their speaking course and their anxiety levels was determined. Also in investigations about FLSA and competence groups of Turkish EFL learners' at university level, FLSA level was moderate among the students in their foreign language lessons (Köse, 2005; Balemir, 2009; Çakar, 2009) but a low level of English speaking anxiety was detected in another study (Öztürk, 2012). Another study was about FLSA from learners' and teachers' points of view. Results showed that the learners experienced some foreign language speaking anxiety but not so high (Saltan, 2003). And as for personality traits and FLSA, a significant relation was not detected between personality traits and foreign language learning anxiety of learners (Köksal et al., 2014). Besides, no correlation was detected in an investigation between anxiety and self-efficacy levels of participants (Çubukçu, 2008).

As seen from the investigations in the field, anxiety influences foreign language learning both positively and negatively, but it can be deduced that the negative effects are more than positive ones and anxiety obstructs performance and learning. This view is mostly agreed upon. However, Sparks et al. (2000) introduce the Linguistic Coding Differences Hypothesis (LCHD) which suggests that a person's native language learning ability and

language aptitude is crucial in foreign language learning. According to this hypothesis, anxiety does not cause students' foreign language learning difficulties but rather their foreign language learning difficulties cause their anxiety.

Anxiety also establishes negative effects on one's self as a speaker cannot express herself/himself thoroughly in foreign language (Foss and Reitzell, 1988). Horwitz and Young (1991) support this suggestion as well since learning a foreign language has great effects on learner's own perception of her/himself. According to them, foreign language learning has the biggest effect and threat on self-concept and self-expression of learners. High anxiety level not only affects foreign language learning process, but influence learners' performance in language class as well.

An investigation about proficiency level of learners and their FLSA was conducted in different levels of competency (Saito and Samimy, 1996). 257 students were chosen from a university in the USA for the study and these students were taking Japanese courses. In this study, competency level of Japanese learners and their FLSA at beginning, intermediate and advanced proficiency levels were investigated. A questionnaire having six subscales was used for data collection; language class anxiety, concern for grades, attitude towards the Japanese class, strength of motivation, language class sociability and language class risk-taking. Two subscales, anxiety and risk-taking, were about speaking anxiety. According to the findings, advanced level students had more anxiety in speaking than beginning and intermediate level learners. The least anxious groups were the intermediate level and beginning level respectively. According to the researchers, one of the reasons for this result could stem from the curriculum where speaking in the advanced level Japanese classes was given less importance than reading and writing.

In some EFL contexts, learners may not use and practice their English enough and the level of FLSA is related with these EFL contexts where speaking opportunity is less (Liu, 2006). Accordingly, learners' foreign language anxiety may be connected to their proficiency level; so, learners' foreign language speaking anxiety may decrease as their language proficiency rises. However, different levels of proficiency in researches have revealed different FLSA degrees (Saito and Samimy, 1996).

In brief, the definition of anxiety, anxiety types, foreign language anxiety and finally foreign language speaking anxiety are given in this section. Foreign language anxiety generally refers to foreign language speaking anxiety, and the reasons for this are also

given. The sources of FLSA and the ways to reduce or eliminate them are also discussed. The next part is dedicated to self-efficacy and foreign language self-efficacy.

2.4 Background of Self-Efficacy

This part is dedicated to the definition of self-efficacy (SE), its relations with other disciplines and self-efficacy dimensions. After this information, self-efficacy and foreign language learning and foreign language speaking self-efficacy are discussed.

2.4.1 Definition of Self-Efficacy

Beliefs of capability or self-perceptions of people about themselves to perform tasks or learn new things at certain levels comprise self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Other researchers also have tried to make definition of self-efficacy but what they have done is just referring to definition of Bandura and paraphrasing it. For example according to Schunk (2001), self-efficacy has a place in human functioning theory of Bandura and beliefs about an individual's capabilities to perform or learn behaviors at certain levels. McCombs (2001) defines self-efficacy as judgments of learners about their competency to complete a task successfully. Again, Pintrich and Schunk (1996) referring to Bandura, (1986) define SE as judgments of individuals about their capabilities to coordinate and carry out actions to realize certain performances. Huang and Chang (1996) defines self-efficacy as a person's ability to succeed in a given work or duty.

Self-efficacy is also in close relations with perceptions of oneself. According to Hoy and Spero (2005), self-efficacy is not just related to actual level of competence but rather it refers to perceptions of competence in a judgment of the future. It is also suggested by Dellinger et al. (2008) that there are mutual relations among behavior, personal factors and environment; as personal factors and environment affect behavior, environment is affected by behavior and personal factors as well; besides, behavior and environment affect personal factors to some extent also.

2.4.2. Self-Efficacy and Social Learning Theory

Bandura (1997) published his well-known article, *Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change* and his famous book *Social Learning Theory*. With these publications, the term self-efficacy was also introduced. The term 'social learning theory' comprises social perspective and behavioral principles. Here, it should be mentioned that the stimulus response sequences of behaviorism cannot explain human behavior from

social perspective point of view. According to social learning theory, the situation, person's behavior, her/his emotions and cognitions interact with each other and determine human behavior or action. Social learning theorists have tried to define the nature of human behavior through behavioral and environmental factors (Rotter, 1966; Bandura, 1997). Bandura has also investigated how people conduct their affective states, behaviors, thought patterns and motivation, and which collective and personal efficacy beliefs are used by people in this process. In his opinion, an individual's perceived abilities have an effect on that individual's behavior.

Learning in a social context happens through modeling and observation (Rotter, 1966; Bandura, 1997). Three interacting phases exist; behavior, perception and environment. Human learning can take place if these phases cooperate with each other. According to social learning theory, when there is a mutual relation between behavior and environment, human learning happens. The early studies of efficacy depend on social learning theory of Rotter's (1966). This theory suggests that since personality depends on the environment a person lives in, personality is demonstrated through people's interaction with their environment. Also, in order to understand a behavior, both the environment and individual should be taken into consideration because an individual's behaviors are not mechanical responses to environmental stimuli. It can be suggested that the behavior depends on the way of an individual's thinking and so, the behavior changes, if the way of an individual's thinking changes; and also the behavior reshapes according to new conditions if the environment changes (Rotter, 1966).

Many investigations on efficacy have been conducted in accordance with Bandura's self-efficacy ideas and his social cognitive theory. His theory points out the importance of cognitive concepts for the first time and endeavors to formulate the reciprocal relation between behavior and cognition. Here, the center of the attention is not only the cognition's effects on people's behavior, but also their cognitive operation in social experiences. Therefore, it can be asserted that in order to understand human adaptation and change in social cognitive theory of Bandura (1997), environmental factors and human agency should be regarded as equally important besides biological aspects. From this information, it can be asserted that the causation model forms the basis of social cognitive theory. Here, causation means functional dependence between events (Bandura, 1997) and

a triadic reciprocal causation exists among environment, personal factors and behavior (Bandura 1986).

In social cognitive theory, human functioning can be explained through triadic reciprocal causation. Here, besides affecting each other, environmental and personal factors are influenced from one another. Social cognitive theory consists of three environmental structures such as imposed, selected and constructed. Various personal agencies are required to form these environmental structures (Bandura, 1997; Bandura, 2001). It may also be suggested that there is no equal strength among different sources of influence. Reciprocal causation does not guarantee equal strength, some may be weaker and some may be stronger. Reciprocal influences do not appear at the same time. Causal factors need time to apply their effects and trigger reciprocal influences (Bandura, 1986).

Bandura (1986) also illustrates the cooperation between environmental factors and personal characteristics. He asserts that social impacts have the power of tutoring, social persuasion and modeling, and they stimulate emotional reactions and transfer information. And people's cognitive competencies, hopes and beliefs are not only developed but also transformed through these social impacts. In order to influence their social environment, people do not have to do or say anything; they can generate this influence with their observable characteristics and social status (Bandura, 1989). Since there is mutual effect between environment and behavior, people can be assumed both as a product and a producer of their environment (Bandura, 1986).

It can also be asserted that human activity generates social structures and as a result of this, personal development and functioning are both restrained and provided facilitating sources and opportunity structures through social structural practices (Bandura, 2001). For example, students' level of achievement affects teaching ability of their teacher; if the success of students grows, the opinion of their teacher's own level of teaching ability grows as well. And if the teachers' level of efficacy grows, they try to contribute their students' success more. Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) draw attention to some differences between the Bandura tradition and the Rotter tradition. According to Rotter school of thought, teachers cannot teach as efficient as possible if they regard environmental factors more impressive than their own teaching abilities. However, although the influence of environmental factors is important in the Bandura tradition, teacher efficacy does not depend only on these factors. Environmental factors have power to some extent but

teachers may regard themselves as having enough efficacies to overwhelm these environmental factors.

Bandura is very famous for his social learning theory and the idea of observation through which a child can learn. Later, he added motivation and self-regulation elements to his theory and its name has become social cognitive theory. Self-efficacy theory is related to human cognition, action, motivation and emotion (Bandura et al., 1996). It is also asserted that the most central and pervasive mechanism is efficacy in human agency (Bandura, 1997). People may be motivated to act or avoid from dangers when they believe their actions can bring out desired consequences or foreseeing the harmful ones (Bandura, 2001).

Self-efficacy component was added to Bandura's theory in 1986. In this component, Bandura suggested that in each individual there is a self-system which consists of affective and cognitive elements such as engaging in self-reflection, adjusting one's own behavior, generating options, learning from others and ability to represent. SE is not a kind of behavior that each individual has or does not have as a permanent standard ability. Instead, it may organize and effectively orient behavioral, emotional, social and cognitive sub skills as a generative capability (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy consists of various self-beliefs connected to total functioning and individuals develop their self-efficacy in different areas of life. For that reason, teachers should know perceived strengths and weaknesses of their students in very specific learning tasks as well as in general learning (Bandura, 2006). Students apply to their self-efficacy judgments, whether task or situation specific, about their abilities when they face a target or objective (Maehr and Pintrich, 1997). So, although Schulze and Schulze (2003) suggest that when a person has a high self-efficacy in a specific area, s/he has high self-efficacy in various areas as well. But, Bruning et al. (1999) suggest the contrary that being highly self-efficient in a specific domain does not automatically require being highly self-efficient in a different domain.

2.4.3 Self-Efficacy and Outcome Expectations, Effort and Feedback

SE has relationship with some points such as outcome expectations, efforts and feedback (Bandura, 1997). For outcome expectancy, weight loss can be given as an example since people generally want to lose weight for some outcomes like social benefits, physical and psychological health benefits etc.

According to Bandura (1997), effort has a great influence on self-efficacy. When a person believes trying hard increases her/his capability, her/his efforts enlarge self-efficacy. However, a person doubts about her/his self-efficacy if the capability is thought as an inherent talent. When capability is seen as a thing to be acquired, sense of self-efficacy may be enhanced as well. And as the last point, self-efficacy of a person may be affected by the quality of feedback s/he receives. When a person receives feedback on her/his work's quality, this may increase her/his self-efficacy slowly. But, a feedback which does not touch the quality may not influence efficacy and productivity (Bandura, 1997).

2.4.4 Self-Efficacy and Self-Esteem

Self-efficacy also has close relations with some constructs such as self-esteem. SE can be applied to specific human behaviors. Even people with low self-esteem may have high self-efficacy levels in one of the fields like sports, foreign language learning or music. On the contrary, they can feel ineffectual in science or math while they have high self-esteem. So, self-esteem is the assessment of self-respect but self-efficacy is the assessment of capability (Epstein and Morling, 1995). People may feel capable of achieving something but this is different from what they think about themselves. Confidence has also close relation with self-efficacy. It is the strength of belief without specifying the certainty (Bandura, 1997).

Perceived self-efficacy affects levels of motivation and activity choice and hence, mainly contributes to the acquisition of the knowledge frameworks. And as a result of this, the impact of perceived SE is crucial in social cognitive theory. SE has also some other components such as physiological and emotional/affective state, verbal persuasion, vicarious experience and mastery experience which can be called as self-efficacy information's major sources (Bandura, 1986; Maehr and Pintrich, 1997; Dweck and Leggett, 1988; Alderman, 1999). Physiological and emotional/affective state has close relations with stress and health functioning. People's emotional reactions and responses to situations in daily lives are among the important factors in self-efficacy. In different situations, people decide about their personal abilities according to their stress levels, physical reactions, emotional states, moods and their physiological states. SE of a student may be affected by pain, tiredness, fear or anxiety (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is especially influenced by anxiety which finally affects the student's performance.

2.4.5 Self-Efficacy and Positive-Negative Comments

The use of self-instruction, encouragement or suggestion can make people believe that they can achieve a task or behavior successfully. These are called verbal judgments or verbal persuasions which are especially related to other people's statements about an individual's capabilities. People have important characters in their lives that may develop some beliefs of self-efficacy in them with their comments. These comments made by these important people are verbal judgments or verbal persuasions (Bandura, 1986; Alderman, 1999).

While positive comments increase self-efficacy, negative comments lower self-efficacy; positive comments can be stimuli to arise curiosity and ability for a learner to succeed a task (Alderman, 1999). According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2007), parents, colleagues and administrators sometimes can provide support interpersonally in teaching context and this support is called as verbal persuasion. For example, the comments that teacher receives from other related people and that may have positive or negative effects on people can be defined as verbal persuasion. It has positive affects when people believe they have necessary capabilities for a task and as a result of this, they really try hard to be successful. On the contrary, unrealistic comments on people's abilities may give harm to their beliefs in their capabilities and so people may fail in tasks (Bandura, 1997).

2.4.6 Self-Efficacy and Vicarious Experience

Vicarious experience is another component to affect SE. It is the observation of other people while they perform threatening activities without negative results. It is simply a modeling matter and vicarious experience shows that the task is 'do-able' with enough persistence and effort through symbolic modeling or live modeling and so it can positively affect self-efficacy of a person. It occurs when people compare their performance with others. The influence of this experience is lower than mastery experience, but still it can be an advantageous instructional instrument. Efficacy beliefs of people increase when their performance is better than the norms of a chosen group. Otherwise, they decrease. In the same way, when people learn exceptional methods to deal with obstacles from their models, this may influence their efficacy beliefs positively (Bandura, 1997).

Here, it is important that typical features such as teaching experience, race and gender of model should be similar to those of the observer and the eventual success from these vicarious experiences depends on this (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2007). Bandura (1989) also emphasizes the importance of vicarious capability and asserts that social and cognitive

development of an individual may be obstructed, dangerous and boring if that individual acquires skills and knowledge through direct experiences. Besides, trusting only in trial and error experiences may result dangerous outcomes (Bandura, 1989).

2.4.7 Self-Efficacy and Mastery Experience

The last and the most effective type of experience affecting self-efficacy is mastery experience. Mastery experience includes performance accomplishments of people, i.e. their past failures or successes and their struggle for success. It requires subjective evaluation of one's past experience of a particular skill or task. In similar situations expectations of the same experiences occur. For example, repeated success of a behavior develops strong self-efficacy expectations and repeated failures develop reduced self-efficacy expectations. Bandura (1984) also emphasizes the difference between vicarious learning and mastery experiences.

In sum, after self-efficacy and its definition are given above, theories about self-efficacy and factors related to it are presented above. In the following part, self-efficacy and its dimensions are discussed.

2.4.8 Dimensions of Self-Efficacy

Before self-efficacy was accepted as a part of social cognitive theory, Bandura (1977) identified human motivation with outcome expectations. Mastery modeling techniques have been used for treatment of phobic individuals and in this treatment period, it was determined that all of the subjects were able to communicate with the object of their fear without any negative results (Zimmerman, 2000). It has been suggested that motivation is influenced by both self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Therefore, SE expectancies diversify in three dimensions: magnitude or level, generality and strength.

People sometimes feel difficulty in what they have ability to do easily and this is defined as magnitude or level of self-efficacy. Carrying out simple tasks or developing more difficult tasks or consisting of very hard tasks may be included in the perceived personal efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Each magnitude or level of a task requires various levels of challenge or presents impediments to perform successfully and so perceived capability for an individual is measured according to these magnitudes or levels.

Generally, self-efficacy of people is affected by their success or failure in similar situations or contexts at different levels. This is called generality of self-efficacy. Some efficacy

beliefs have more importance than others for people. In addition, people build their lives around the most fundamental self-beliefs (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura (2001), people feel more efficacious in some activities or areas and generality includes this variety. Sometimes people believe in themselves about performing a task or a behavior and this resoluteness refers to the strength of self-efficacy (Maddux, 1995). Strength of efficacy is the degree of people's persistence or endurance when they face obstacles in performance of tasks such as pain, frustration, challenges or hardships. The quantity of people's convictions against a behavior or a task shows the strength of perceived efficacy (Bandura, 1997). It can be suggested that there are close relations between self-efficacy and motivation. In other words, the outcomes and goals are configured by personal efficacy beliefs and these factors manage the motivation. Therefore, it may be very beneficial for an individual to have perceived self-efficacy and the more people have perceived self-efficacy, the more they try hard to succeed (Ekizoglu and Ozcinar, 2010). Furthermore, people having high self-efficacy may insist on overwhelming difficulties in achieving challenging tasks (Skoretz, 2011).

To sum up, self-efficacy is important succeed or fail in a task. How people believe in themselves play an important role to define their SE levels.

2.4.9 Self-Efficacy and its Applications

Self-efficacy has a crucial role in various areas of human action. Several of these areas necessitate some mastery and personal control. Therefore, the reasons for specific fears, anxiety and depression may have roots in low self-efficacy. In human adaptation, self-regulation is accepted as the most crucial cognitive capacity and as a result of this, it is intensely used in different psychological counseling programs and treatments (Maddux and Meier, 1995). People having high self-efficacy can aim difficult tasks and goals, make plans and self-regulate themselves in order to achieve these challenging goals. Self-efficacy theory asserts that human actions such as people's beliefs in their capabilities or perceived self-efficacy influence somehow human functioning (Bandura, 1997). Here success and successful results are emphasized and the things that may go wrong or personal deficiencies are not taken into consideration. Therefore, it can be asserted that setting challenging goals and high aspirations are valid only for individuals having higher self-efficacy who try hard to achieve these goals at cognitive level.

Emotional states are also adjusted through self-efficacy at affective level. Although difficulties seem manageable for people having high self-efficacy, same difficulties, threats and risks seem bigger and not manageable for people lacking self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy is important in thought control domain as well. Performance is highly influenced by self-efficacy in thought control. In order to be successful against any difficult tasks, situations or skills, first an individual has to avoid any kinds of negative thinking and distractions. After eliminating these negative thinking, they should concentrate on their activity and motivate themselves for a successful achievement. Poor performance can occur for people having low self-efficacy at this stage, since they may doubt about themselves and this may affect their performance (Bandura, 1997).

It can be suggested that self-efficacy is advantageous for many disciplines and needs to be improved. According to Mosier (1997), some factors to improve self-efficacy can be as the followings; a) complex tasks should be divided into smaller components to be more manageable; b) tasks should be arranged according to their difficulty levels i.e. easier tasks should come first; c) learners should be given continuous encouragement; d) learners' own ability and work should be accounted as success; e) change from low self-efficacy to higher should be accepted as progress; f) lapses should be seen as opportunities to find out the reasons for lapses; g) modeling should be used for providing experience.

2.4.10 Self-Efficacy and Education

In education, self-efficacy concept is very important. Individuals decide about the activities they try, their efforts for tasks and the degree of their persistence against challenges according to their judgments about their capabilities. Therefore, learners having high self-efficacy aim higher targets, use critical thinking strategies and skills, develop their present self-efficacy level in accordance to their progress, make decisions, does not quit easily and try harder for success. So, success is more probable for learners having high self-efficacy (Bandura and Schunk, 1981; Lent et al., 1984; Schunk and Hanson, 1985; Bouffard-Bouchard, 1990; Pajares, 1996).

It has been observed in studies that student learning is increased by high self-efficacy (Pajares, 1996; Schulze and Schulze, 2003). Approaches to be successful and new skills are learned better by students having high self-efficacy. These students are confident enough to manage and solve the problems in their lives. They may become lifelong learners and ready for their professional lives through aspects like goal-setting, rewards,

modeling, self-efficacy assessments and feedback. Research has also confirmed that self-efficacy affects motivation (Pajares, 1996; Schunk, 2003) and there are positively significant relations between self-efficacy and learner autonomy and self-efficacy and academic success (Tilfarlioglu and Ciftci, 2011; Yılmaz, 2010) but there is a negative correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing apprehension (Erkan and Saban, 2011). Responsive Classroom (RC) Approach has close relation with self-efficacy beliefs as well. It was determined that using more RC practices may increase self-efficacy beliefs (Rimm-Kaufman and Sawyer, 2004). Besides, there are significant relations between Openness and Conscientiousness and classroom management efficacy of teachers (Burkett, 2011).

In sum, it seems obvious that self-efficacy has close relations with other disciplines. SE and FLL together with speaking are discussed below. And some researches and their results are also given.

2.4.11 Self-Efficacy and Foreign Language Learning and Speaking

There is a positive relation between self-efficacy and academic performance and self-efficacy has a positive relation with student persistence at different levels and areas and also, self-efficacy is an important predictor of subsequent performances (Multon et al., 1991). Besides, self-efficacy is accepted as an important variable in language learners' success (Cotterall, 1999).

In the field of FLL, a few studies were dedicated to self-efficacy theory, especially in late 1990's. In a study, reading and writing were investigated. The participants were from a university English program. At the end of the investigation, students' self-efficacy was found to be significantly related to their grades on writing and reading parts of their TOEFL exam (Huang and Chang, 1996).

Another study was conducted with two groups of EFL students in Japan; one group consisted of high-efficacious students and the other consisted of low-efficacious students. After the *t*-test, an important difference was determined between the scores of two groups (Templin, 1999). Another study was conducted again in Japan to determine the effects of self-efficacy on students' English ability. Participants received SE instruction for one semester and a self-efficacy questionnaire and an English test were applied before and after the instruction. The findings proved the benefits of self-efficacy instruction (Templin et al., 2001).

Another study was dedicated to SE rating and the language learning strategy usage (Chamot et al., 1996). It was held in Australia among 135 high school students learning different foreign languages. The findings proved that self-efficacy and strategy use were significantly and positively correlated.

Another study was conducted in Malaysia on relationship between students' English language achievement and self-efficacy (Mahyuddin et al., 2006). The proportion of students having low self-efficacy and high self-efficacy is almost same. Some dimensions of self-efficacy such as self-assertiveness, several other expectancy beliefs and academic achievement efficacy showed positive correlations after analysis. According to the results, having high self-efficacy increases success in English language.

Another study was dedicated to a single case study which included freshman's self-efficacy beliefs about learning English with different tasks at home and school. It was found out that self-efficacy beliefs of learners were flexible and depending on tasks and their self-efficacy beliefs were related to their self-perceptions, difficulty level of tasks, their interests, social and cultural context, and their attitudes toward English (Wang and Pape, 2007). Another study was conducted by Gahungu (2007) about the strategy use, SE, and language ability of English students. The findings showed these three variables had positive and significant relations among themselves. Although the learners did not have definite motivation to study foreign language, they did not oppose the requirements of the program, and this influenced their strategic behavior.

Another study was conducted in Botswana for three years on relations between self-efficacy beliefs, proficiency, preferred language strategies and age (Magogwe and Oliver, 2007). According to findings, although many language learning strategies are used by students, they prefer specific types of strategies. Also these four variables have dynamic correlations among themselves.

To sum up, this chapter starts with the definition of personality. After definition by different scholars are presented, the two aspects, i.e. character and temperament are discussed. Beside of the aspects, personality has also some factors; these are hereditary and physical factors and environmental and social factors. These factors and their subgroups are discussed. There are also four main personality theories; psychoanalytic, behavioristic, humanistic personality theories and trait and factor theories. Each theory is explained with examples in this chapter. After the description of personality theories, history of

personality traits is given. In this part, first trait investigations, the instrument used to measure personality traits, the history and dimensions of the big five studies and investigations on Big Five are discussed. The Big Five studies in different cultures and languages and out of Europe are introduced. Then, the relations between foreign language learning and personality traits and the Big Five are discussed with related literature and research samples.

After introducing the personality, definition of speaking and anxiety are given. The definition and theories about speaking are discussed. Production, interaction and communicative competence and their relations with speaking are given. Then, anxiety is explained. There are two classifications of anxiety types; the first has three anxiety types such as trait, state and situation specific anxieties. The second has two categories of anxiety such as facilitative anxiety and debilitating anxiety. It is obvious that anxiety affects FLL; these effects and components of FLA are discussed. As for components of FLA test anxiety, fear of negative evaluation and communication apprehension are discussed. Then, reasons of FLA and communication apprehension are discussed and some solution for these negative feeling are given. At the end of anxiety part, some researches are mentioned.

After anxiety the third component of the current study, foreign language speaking self-efficacy is handled. First, definition of self-efficacy is given. Later, its relation with social learning theory is discussed. After this, the relations between self-efficacy and outcome expectations, effort and feedback, self-esteem, confidence and perceived self-efficacy are discussed. Positive-negative comments, vicarious experience and mastery experience and self-efficacy are also discussed. After explaining the dimensions, applications and the role in education of self-efficacy, self-efficacy and foreign language learning and speaking are discussed with related investigations.

In sum, according to the literature discussed above it can be suggested that there is a negative relation between FLSA and FLSSE; that is to say, when speaking anxiety increases speaking self-efficacy decreases and vice versa. However, personality traits factor should also be included into speaking anxiety and self-efficacy factors. In addition, different contexts, cultures, languages and variables may influence the personalities of learners and therefore, this may affect their foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy levels as well. The studies on foreign language learning and personality traits

indicate that personality traits are important components of foreign language speaking and they play crucial role especially in speaking anxiety and self-efficacy.





CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In the present chapter, the methodology used for conducting the study is articulated. Research design, description of the sampling of the participants and institutions are also included in this section. Instruments of the study and their validity and reliability, data collection procedure and data analysis are described as well.

3.1 Model of the Study

A description of a research's processes (Smith and Albaum, 2012) and solutions to problems and transformation of the situation to a better condition (Friedman, 2003) consist of a research's model. The current study has the features of quantitative research design which has comparative and correlational characters in nature. Quantitative research is a form of research using empirical methods and statements while collecting data (Cohen et al., 2013). In a quantitative research, it is important to gather numerical data and generalize it to groups of people for a particular phenomenon (Babbie, 2015). Therefore, quantitative research was used in the current study to determine the personality traits, FLSA and FLSSE levels of participants.

The current study is also a descriptive study since it describes what exists and may show new facts and meaning beyond what is supposed to exist. It includes the observation, description and documentation of a situation while it is normally happening and the data of a descriptive study give a description or account of groups, situations or individuals and these data are collected through questionnaires (Polit and Hungler, 1999). In order to obtain data about the characteristics of the sample being investigated descriptive research

was used (Burns and Bush, 2003). Fundamentally, descriptive research has closed-ended questions and these questions limit the unique insight. In current study, descriptive research was applied to have demographic information of participants.

In this study, correlation between personality traits, FLSA and FLSSE was also investigated. In a correlation study, the nature of the relationship between variables in real world is systematically investigated and explained. The data obtained from descriptive research in this study were quantifiable data which could be quantified and counted. Therefore, these data were analyzed in a correlational way. A correlation study does not just describe what exists but makes a detailed investigation on relationships between two or more variables (Porter and Carter, 2000). Moreover, a correlational study investigates relations among two or more quantitative variables and tries to make predictions according to an understanding of those relationships (Johnson and Christensen, 2004). Therefore, this study can be accepted as primarily a correlational study.

3.2 The Sample

A selected unit of a population is sampling; the information is collected from this population and it gives insights about the overall participants. For this reason, the precision and accuracy in a study mostly depend on sampling planning (Smith and Albaum, 2012). And people from whom researchers or a program are interested in collecting information or data consist the population in an investigation (Hair et al., 2006).

Convenience sampling was also applied because the participants were chosen according to their existence at the time of application of questionnaires, since convenience sampling was used to obtain data from the participants in accordance with their convenience of accessibility and proximity to the investigators (Gay et al., 2011).

The location where a survey is conducted is called sampling location (Gay et al., 2011). The sampling location of this study was Turkey. The participants were drawn from thirty one universities from different parts of Turkey according to their existence at the time of questionnaires.

In order to have an effective measure for an accurate and reliable decision making, sample size is very important (Henry, 2013). Factors such as resource constraints, sample size in similar studies, type of analysis, number of variables, nature of research and importance of decision should be taken into consideration to choose an appropriate sample size (Mason,

2010). Some researchers suggest that a sample size should include more than 100 participants (MacCallum et al., 1999) while others suggest that a sample should not be less than 250 (Cattell, 1978). In this study, 923 4th year students of English Language Teaching departments and 922 4th year students of English Language and Literature departments from 31 different universities in Turkey, totally over 2000 students, participated in the study. A sample of over 2000 four-year ELT-ELL students attending various Turkish universities completed the questionnaires voluntarily according to their convenience and the data were analyzed with SPSS 22.0 (Green and Salkind, 2010).

The current research was conducted without any intervention; data were collected at one time and the participants were measured once during Spring 2015. The data were collected from this population during the spring semester of 2015, from February 2015 till July 2015. After collection, the data were classified into two categories, one for English Language Teaching students and the other for English Language and Literature students. All questions in all questionnaires should have been answered fully. Therefore, cases with any missing responses were accepted as false participants and were eliminated. After the removal of missing responses, final *n*-size was 1845.

Participants' Background Information

In Table 1 the demographic information of the participants is illustrated.

Table 1

Demographic Information for the Participants

Demography	ELL		ELT	
	n	%		%
Gender				
Female	630	68.3	643	69.7
Male	292	31.7	280	30.3
Country (Have you ever been in a country/countries where English is widely spoken?)				
Yes	154	16.7	138	15.0
No	768	83.3	785	85.0
Language Group (Were you in a language group in high school?)				
Yes	496	53.8	636	68.9
No	426	46.2	287	31.1
English Course (Have you ever attended any English courses outside of your university during your university life?)				
Yes	99	10.7	79	8.6
No	823	89.3	844	91.4
Academic Success				
Low	69	7.5	66	7.2
Medium	652	70.7	640	69.3
High	201	21.8	217	23.5
Academic Satisfaction				
Yes	668	72.5	665	72.0
No	254	27.5	258	28.0
Difficult skills				
Reading	46	4.9	36	3.9
Writing	117	12.7	143	15.5
Speaking	257	27.9	217	23.5
Listening	438	47.6	420	45.5
Grammar	64	6.9	107	11.6
Strong skills				
Reading	357	38.7	355	38.5
Writing	260	28.2	139	15.1
Speaking	109	11.9	141	15.3
Listening	81	8.8	59	6.4
Grammar	115	12.4	229	24.8
Foreign language (Except English)				
Yes	309	33.5	347	37.6
No	613	66.5	576	62.4

643 (69.7%) of the participants are female and 280 (30.3%) of them are male in ELT Departments and 630 (68.3%) of the participants are female and 292 (31.7%) of them are male in ELL Departments. 138 (15%) participants in ELT Departments and (16.4%) participants in ELL Departments have been in a country where English is widely spoken. 636 (68.9%) participants in ELT Departments and 496 (53.8%) participants in ELL Departments were in English group in high school. 79 (8.6%) participants in ELT Departments and 99 (10.7%) participants in ELL Departments attended to extra English courses out of their universities. 217 (23.5%) participants regard their academic success as high, 640 (69.3%) as medium and 66 (7.2%) as low in ELT Departments, and 201 (21.8%) participants regard their academic success as high, 652 (70.7%) as medium and 69 (7.5%) as low in ELL Departments.

In ELT Departments 36 (3.9%) participants regard reading, 143 (15.5%) regard writing, 117 (12.7%) regard speaking, 420 (45.5%) regard listening and 207 (22.49%) regard grammar as their most difficult language skill. And in ELL Departments 46 (4.9%) participants regard reading, 117 (12.7%) regard writing, 257 (27.9%) regard speaking, 438 (47.6%) regard speaking and 64 (6.9%) regard grammar as their most difficult language skill.

In ELT Departments 355 (38.5%) participants regard reading, 139 (15.1%) regard writing, 141 (15.3%) regard speaking, 59 (6.4%) regard listening and 229 (24.8%) regard grammar as their strongest language skill. And in ELL Departments 357 (38.7%) participants regard reading, 260 (28.2%) regard writing, 109 (11.9%) regard speaking, 81 (8.8%) regard listening and 115 (12.4%) regard grammar as their strongest language skill.

In ELT Departments 347 (37.6%) participants know and 576 (62.4%) participants do not know and in ELL Departments 309 (33.5%) participants know and 613 (66.5%) participants do not know another foreign language except English.

The average English language study year is 10.58 for ELT and 9.11 for ELL Departments and the average ages of the participants are 22.76 for ELT students, and 22.97 for ELL students.

3.3 Data Collection

This was a quantitative study and used structured questionnaires to collect data from the participants. Questionnaire is one of the tools to collect data for any research and draw out

information to be discussed and tabulated (Taylor-Powell, 1998) and its purpose is to determine the needed information for the study and how this information is benefitted (Bird, 2009). A questionnaire consists of some elements; types and structures of questions, the wording of questions, design and order of the questions, the response alternatives and instructions about application of the questionnaire (Burgess, 2001; Groves et al., 2009). The questionnaire of current study had two parts. The first part included the personal profiles and demographic information of the participants. This demographic questionnaire included information about department, age and gender of the participants, their duration of studying English, evaluation of their academic success, their strongest and weakest language skills.

And the second part included three different questionnaires containing dependent-independent variables such as personality traits, foreign language speaking anxiety and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. The aim and content of each questionnaire were explained at the beginning to make it more understandable and to eliminate the problems for the investigation. The surveys were conducted by the researcher himself and the lecturers of ELT and ELL Departments of different Turkish universities to have a nationwide sampling for the study.

Data were collected from 4th year students attending English Language Teaching and English Language and Literature departments by means of three questionnaires. There existed no manipulations of data or any experiments in the study; just three different questionnaires were used to collect data.

The data were generated from the following tools:

1. The Big Five Inventory: The Big Five Personality Traits are called Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness. The Big Five Inventory is a questionnaire consisting of 44 short-phrase items and it assesses personality traits (John et al., 1991; John and Srivastava, 1999; Benet-Martínez and John, 1998; John et al., 2008). It rates on a five-step scale from 1-“disagree strongly” to 5-“agree strongly”. In order to show the most prototypical and core traits for definitions of Big Five domains, empirical item analyses and consensual expert judgment are applied in selection. High reliabilities are observed in previous research (Benet-Martínez and John, 1998; John et al., 2008; Soto et al., 2008). The alpha reliabilities of BFI scales range from .79 to .88 with average above .83. According to Rammstedt and John (2005; 2007), validity correlations were found .88

for Extraversion; .81 for Openness; .84 for Neuroticism; .79 for Agreeableness and .47 for Conscientiousness, with an average of .82.

In order to determine the internal reliability of The Big Five Inventory for the current study, personality traits were categorized and the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of each personality trait was found out separately. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of the five personality traits are given below:

Table 2

Reliability Statistics of Agreeableness

Reliability Statistics of Agreeableness	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.605	9

According to the Table 2 above, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found .61 for Agreeableness.

Table 3

Reliability Statistics of Openness

Reliability Statistics of Openness	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.692	10

According to the Table 3 above, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found .69 for Openness.

Table 4

Reliability Statistics of Conscientiousness

Reliability Statistics of Conscientiousness	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.681	9

According to the Table 4 above, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found .68 for Conscientiousness.

Table 5

Reliability Statistics of Extraversion

Reliability Statistics of Extraversion	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.619	8

According to the Table 5 above, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found .62 for Extraversion.

Table 6

Reliability Statistics of Neuroticism

Reliability Statistics of Neuroticism	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.624	8

According to the Table 6 above, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found .62 for Neuroticism.

As it can be seen in tables above, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found .62 for Extraversion; .69 for Openness; .62 for Neuroticism; .61 for Agreeableness and .68 for Conscientiousness, with an average of .65. Therefore, it may be suggested that the questionnaire items used in the current study have a fairly good internal consistency.

2. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale: Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale developed by Horwitz et al. (1986) is a standard instrument for investigators to find out the level and degree of foreign language anxiety occurring in foreign language classrooms. Horwitz et al. (1986) developed this scale as a standard instrument to find out definite anxiety reactions of learners in various foreign language learning settings (Aida, 1994). Foreign language anxiety is closely related to performance evaluation in different contexts such as social or academic and therefore, foreign language anxiety is also related to some performance anxieties such as communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation; and the items presented in FLCAS reflect the communication apprehension, test-anxiety and fear of negative evaluation of foreign language learners (Horwitz et al., 1986). Therefore, it is used to measure anxiety level of a learner in foreign language learning context. FLCAS consists of 33 items on 5 points Likert scale. The responses change from (a) "strongly disagree" to (e) "strongly agree". A single answer for each item is required from participants. In the scale, the highest level of anxiety for each item receives five points, and the lowest receives one point; strongly agree (5 points), agree (4 points), neither agree or disagree (3 points), disagree (2 points), strongly disagree (1 point).

Some items in Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale are worded negatively. These items are scored reversely. For instance, participants receive five points for 'strongly

disagree' and one point for 'strongly agree' in the item "I would not be nervous speaking the foreign language with native speakers" (Horwitz and Young, 1986).

This scale is accepted valid and reliable by many researchers in the field (Aida, 1994; Horwitz et al., 1986; Price, 1991). Horwitz and Young (1991) conducted a study and FLCAS was administered to approximately 300 students in introductory undergraduate foreign language classes at the University of Texas to examine the reliability and validity of the FLCAS. Internal consistency of the original scale was 0.93 and results revealed test-retest reliability after 8 weeks with a significant correlation coefficient was $r = .83$, ($p < .01$).

In order to determine the internal reliability of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale for the current study, internal consistency of 33 items was tested through Cronbach's Alpha coefficient.

Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of the FLCAS is given below:

Table 7

Reliability Statistics of FLCAS

Reliability Statistics of FLCAS	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.921	33

According to the Table 7 above, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for 33 items was found to be .92. for FLCAS. Therefore, it may be suggested that the questionnaire items used in the current study have a real good internal consistency.

3. The Questionnaire of English Self-Efficacy (QESE): Wang (2004) developed the Questionnaire of English Self-Efficacy (QESE) scale with young Chinese English language learners in the USA and their verbal protocols, observations and interviews. There are 32 items, and the participants are required to evaluate their capabilities to carry out certain tasks while they use English as a foreign language. The scale is measured on a 7-point rating scale from 1 (I cannot do it at all) to 7 (I can do it very well) and designed to measure the following four areas: (a) self-efficacy for listening (Items 1, 3, 9, 10, 15, 22, 24, and 27); (b) self-efficacy for speaking (Items 4, 6, 8, 17, 19, 20, 23, and 30); (c) self-efficacy for reading (Items 2, 12, 16, 21, 25, 26, 29, and 32); and (d) self-efficacy for writing in English (Items 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 18, 28, and 31). Since the present study is investigating foreign language speaking self-efficacy, only the items about self-efficacy for speaking (Items 4, 6, 8, 17, 19, 20, 23, and 30) are used with permission of Mr. Wang. It is

recorded that internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha is .96) test-retest reliability is .82, the concurrent validity is .55, and the predictive validity is .41.

In order to determine the internal reliability of The Questionnaire of English Self-Efficacy for the current study, internal consistency of 8 items was tested through Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is given below:

Table 8

Reliability Statistics of FLSSE

Reliability Statistics of FLSSE

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.926	8

According to the Table 8 above, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for 8 items was found to be .93 for FLSSE. Accordingly, it may be suggested that the questionnaire items used in the current study have a good internal consistency.

Reliability in a scale means stability and consistent results after repeated measurements on the participants (Malhotra et al., 2014). Reliability test is performed to minimize any unexpected failure and interruption (Hans, 2000). According to Greg (2009), when Cronbach's alpha is 0.9 or more, reliability is high; when it is between 0.7-0.9, reliability is medium; and when it is below 0.7, reliability is low. Based on this information, the reliabilities of the scales used in the current study can be considered as quite high.

3.4 Data Analysis

In an investigation, the objects should be mapped meaningfully and the relationships should be built among the numbers and variables that the investigator is interested in; this process is called as scale of measurement (Sahai and Khurshid, 1996). Stevens (1946) suggests that there are four categories in scale of measurement; these are nominal, ordinal, interval and ratio. In the current study, nominal and interval scales are used. Nominal scales are the numbers which are used as labels to identify the objects and one-to-one relationship exists between the numbers (Stevens, 1946). Nominal scale was used at the beginning of the questionnaires of the current study in Personal Information part to measure demographic profiles of the participants such as age, gender, education etc. However, in interval scales participants demonstrate their agreement levels through some statements about the stimulant object (Pfeiffer et al., 2011). Interval scales were also used in the current study based on one questionnaire with 7 categories of Likert scale in which 1

meant totally 'unable to do this', 7 meant 'able to do this' and 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 represented intermediate judgments, and two questionnaires with 5 categories of Likert scale ranging from 1 (strong disagreement) to 5 (strong agreement) and 2, 3 and 4 representing intermediate judgments. Besides, participants were required to circle the number which reflected themselves best for each statement without any right or wrong answers.

The data were analyzed using the Statistic Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) through descriptive (means, percentages and standard deviations) and inferential statistics (regression and correlation); so identified features of the data in the study were described. In order to discover whether any significant correlations or differences exist among variables, inferential statistics were applied as well.

As the first step, the questionnaires were checked in order to ensure the quality of data obtained and to see whether these data are in accordance with the objectives of the current study. This inspection was done to check the missing pages and wrong sequences. As the second step, data editing was applied. Data editing is a review to edit the questionnaires and its purpose is to improve precision and accuracy of collected data and to eliminate the questionnaires with ambiguous, incomplete and illegible responses (Malhotra et al., 2014). Therefore, since some questionnaires were not completed properly by participants and there was incomplete and missing information in them, 300 papers were not included in the analysis. As the third step, data coding was performed. In this process, each possible response was coded to a particular question, data recording and column positions were determined. As the fourth step, coded data were transcribed from the questionnaires into computers. And as the last step before data analysis, the process of data cleaning was performed to check the consistency and missing responses thoroughly and extensively in the computer. The purpose of data cleaning was to control and improve the quality of data (Malhotra et al., 2014).

Data analysis depends on specific questions in accordance with purpose of the research and its hypothesis (Lo et al., 2000). The current study was also a cross-sectional study since the units were measured at only one point in time from the sample (Burns and Bush, 2003).

To identify the relationship between the variables of the current research inferential analysis was used (Patterson et al., 2001). Inferential analysis is an important part of a scientific study since inferential analysis techniques test any hypotheses. While inferring the analysis of the properties of a data sample taken from a population, inferential analysis

employs mathematical methods on probability theory. Through these techniques, the samples are studied and generalizations can be made for the population. Comparisons between different groups can also be possible with inferential statistics; evaluation of the effects of an independent variable on a dependent variable is made with these statistics (Baumgartner, 1990).

First, the mean scores of the data sets were calculated. When all of the values in a data set were added and then divided by the total number of values, the mean score of that certain data set was obtained. Therefore, a mean can be thought as an average or an arithmetic average of the scores (Pallant, 2001; Field, 2009). For this reason, the data were transformed through computing variables to find the mean scores statistically. After finding the mean scores, in order to examine the internal consistencies of the questionnaires of the current study, all Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of the questionnaires were investigated and given in data collection section (Ary et al., 2002; Pallant, 2001). After all Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were given, normal distribution of data was investigated in order to determine methods for further analyses. Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test was applied to check normality of distribution all variables (Pallant, 2001; Field, 2009).

And tests of normality were determined as the following.

Table 9

Tests of Normality of Data

	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig. (p)	Statistic	df	Sig. (p)
FLSSE	.139	1845	.000	.883	1845	.000
FLCAS	.050	1845	.000	.994	1845	.000
Agreeableness	.057	1845	.000	.991	1845	.000
Extraversion	.060	1845	.000	.994	1845	.000
Conscientiousness	.068	1845	.000	.991	1845	.000
Neuroticism	.057	1845	.000	.994	1845	.000
Openness	.054	1845	.000	.992	1845	.000

According to the Table 9, all p values were significant. However, for a normal distribution, p value should not be significant. This means that the data of the current study were not distributed normally. For $\alpha=0.05$, p values of normality tests are 0.000, $p<0.05$. However, since the sample was very large, parametric research models were applied (Bayram, 2015).

But before this, the outliers in the data were determined and cleared. In a normal distribution about 99% of the values lie within three standard deviations (± 3). Therefore, the z -values which are bigger than $+3$ and smaller than -3 are accepted as outliers. However, in large samplings ($n > 100$) it is possible that a few subjects exist out of these limits. In such cases z -value score interval can be accepted as ± 4 (Mertler and Vannatta, 2005). So, z -value score interval was accepted as ± 4 for the current study to clear the outliers. After clearing the outliers the data were ready for parametric analyses.

The independent sample t -test was employed in the current study. It was used to compare the means of two independent groups (Anderson, 1998; Cramer, 1998; Field, 2009); these were the personality traits scores and foreign language speaking anxiety scores of ELT and ELL groups in the current study. The aim was to find out whether related population means were significantly different. This comparison between two unrelated groups, here PTs and FLSA of ELT and ELL, should be on the same constant, dependent variable (Baumgartner, 1990).

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is a statistical tool to measure the strength of association between variables (Malhotra et al., 2014) and is used as a summary of this strength (Dallal, 2007). And in the current study, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to examine the relations between the variables and interrelatedness of them in the data set (Anderson, 1998; Cramer, 1998). Here the purpose was to find any relationships between personality traits, foreign language speaking anxiety and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. Another aim was to see whether there were any relationships and inter-correlations between the variables.

Besides, multiple regression analysis was applied to determine whether there was a mathematical relationship between the variables of the current study (Malhotra et al., 2014). Multiple regression analysis was used to make accurate and powerful predictions among dependent and independent variables and to identify the relationships, if any, between dependent and independent variables (Simon, 2009).

For a multiple regression analysis a multiple regression model is required; this model defines multiple regression analysis results. A multiple regression model is used to test the effects of independent variables on dependent variable and to determine how independent variables affect the dependent variable. This type of analysis is one of the statistical techniques, which allows predicting participant's score on one variable taking her/his

scores on several other variables into consideration and it tries to find out the best combination of independent variables for prediction of dependent variable (Draper et al., 1966). In the current study, there is one dependent variable; foreign language speaking anxiety. And five personality traits (Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism) and foreign language speaking self-efficacy are the independent variables of the study. Moreover, multiple regression analysis was used to determine which independent variables predicted the dependent variable best; that is to say, which of the five personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy predicted the foreign language speaking anxiety best.

An average response score for each participant and a total score were computed. Then general scores for questionnaires and the average responses were calculated. There were both negative and positive statements in Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety Scale (FLCAS); therefore, scores for 9 negative statements (i.e. items 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22, 28 and 32) were modified through code reversing prior to analysis. In order to analyze foreign language speaking anxiety degree and in general, medians, means and standard deviations were calculated. The independent sample *t*-test was employed in order to explore the differences and similarities between foreign language speaking anxiety levels of the participants. There were both negative and positive statements in Big Five Inventory as well; therefore, scores for 16 negative statements were modified through code reversing prior to analysis. In order to analyze personality traits of the participants, degree for each participant and in general, medians, means and standard deviations were calculated.

Since there is no negative statement in foreign language speaking self-efficacy scale, code reversing was not needed and so not any statement was modified. In order to analyze foreign language speaking self-efficacy degree for each proficiency level and in general, medians, means and standard deviations were calculated.

In short, the personality traits of the participants were determined through statistical analysis. The differences in foreign language speaking anxiety and personality traits according to ELT and ELL Departments were investigated through independent sample *t*-test. In order to define the relations between personality traits, foreign language speaking anxiety and foreign language speaking self-efficacy Pearson correlation coefficients were applied. And in order to find out whether the participants' personality traits and foreign

language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety, multiple regression analysis was applied.





CHAPTER IV

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data analysis of the current study in accordance with the research questions and data analysis procedure specified in the previous chapter. The first part of this chapter gives the results of the quantitative data analysis, and the last part presents the discussion of the research questions. First, the analysis of the personality traits of each group is represented, and then discussed; second, significant difference between the mean scores of ELT and ELL students' personality traits is investigated; third, significant difference between the means of foreign language speaking anxiety scores of ELT and ELL students is presented; in fourth and fifth research questions, any significant relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELT and ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy are investigated; and in sixth and seventh research questions whether ELT and ELL students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety is investigated, and then discussed. Each section consists of the findings from the related data collection tool.

4.1 Results

The research questions and their related tables and results are below:

1. Analysis of the Research Question 1: What are the personal traits' scores of 4th year students of English Language Teaching (ELT) and English Language and Literature (ELL) departments?

The answers of the students to the Big Five Inventory were analyzed through descriptive statistics in order to find out the personality traits (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness) of the participants.

Table 10 consists of the minimums, maximums, means and standard deviations of personality traits of the ELT Department participants.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics of Personality Traits of ELT Department Participants

	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Agreeableness	923	1.56	5.00	3.69	.55
Openness	923	1.90	5.00	3.69	.54
Conscientiousness	923	1.67	5.00	3.52	.58
Extraversion	923	1.10	5.00	3.32	.63
Neuroticism	923	1.00	4.88	2.84	.64
Total	923				

Table 10 shows the mean scores of five personality traits of ELT participants. Analysis of the participants' answers to the Big Five inventory reveals that the average mean scores of the personality traits are Agreeableness (M = 3.69), Openness (M = 3.69), Conscientiousness (M = 3.52), Extraversion (M = 3.32) and Neuroticism (M = 2.84) respectively. According to these results, the highest proportions of personality traits for the participants are Agreeableness and Openness, since the mean scores of these two factors are almost same. Then Conscientiousness comes. In the 4th place Extraversion comes. And the smallest proportion of personality traits is Neuroticism. The analysis of the participants' answers also shows that most of the participants are agreeable; participants with open to new experiences are in the second and conscientious participants are in the third place among the Big Five. Extravert participants are in the fourth place. And, as it can be seen in Table 10, the minority group is Neurotics. In sum, ELT participants have all five personality traits.

Table 11 consists of the minimums, maximums, means and standard deviations of personality traits of the ELL Department participants.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics of Personality Traits of ELL Department Participants

	n	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Agreeableness	922	1.89	4.89	3.54	.56
Openness	922	1.30	4.90	3.47	.60
Conscientiousness	922	1.56	5.00	3.33	.60
Extraversion	922	1.40	5.00	3.17	.57
Neuroticism	922	1.00	5.00	2.96	.59
Total	922				

Table 11 shows the mean scores of five personality traits of the participants. Analysis of the participants' answers to the Big Five inventory reveals that the average mean scores of the personality traits are Agreeableness (M = 3.54), Openness (M = 3.47), Conscientiousness (M = 3.33), Extraversion (M = 3.17) and Neuroticism (M = 2.96) respectively. According to these results, the highest proportion of personality traits for the participants is Agreeableness; then Openness and Conscientiousness come. In the 4th place Extraversion comes. And the smallest proportion of personality traits is Neuroticism. Analysis of the participants' answers also shows that most of the participants are agreeable; participants with open to new experiences are in the second and conscientious participants are in the third place among the Big Five. Extravert participants are in the fourth place. And, as it can be seen in Table 11, the minority group is Neurotics. In sum, ELL participants have all five personality traits.

To sum up, the sequences of the personality traits for both groups are same. Moreover, the results show that there are significant differences between personality traits of ELT and ELL groups.

Since the sequence of PTs is same, the items of the inventory for each personality trait and the scores of the participants for these items, and their distributions and interpretations are given below totally for both groups.

In sum, in order to answer the first research question descriptive statistics was applied and the answers of the participants were analyzed to find out their personality traits. According to results, all five personality traits were detected in different portions in both groups and the highest proportion of personality traits of participants is Agreeableness; then Openness

and Conscientiousness come. In the 4th place Extraversion exists. And the smallest proportion of personality traits is Neuroticism for the participants.

After the analyses of the personality traits of the participants, in the next research question, the difference between the mean scores of ELT and ELL students' personality traits is investigated.

2. Analysis of the Research Question 2: Is there a significant difference between the mean scores of ELT and ELL students' personality traits?

The analysis for this question was done through inferential statistics by using independent samples *t*-test. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the two means (ELT-ELL) and determine if there were differences between ELT and ELL groups in terms of Personal Traits (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness). According to the results of the *t*-test, there is a significant difference ($p < .05$) between ELT and ELL with respect to above variables.

Table 12 consists of the mean scores of personality traits and their significance rates of ELT-ELL students.

Table 12

Personality Traits T-test results of ELT-ELL groups

	ELT ($n=923$)		ELL ($n=922$)		t	p
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Agreeableness	3.69	.55	3.54	.56	6.017	.000
Openness	3.69	.54	3.47	.60	8.469	.000
Conscientiousness	3.52	.58	3.33	.60	7.133	.000
Extraversion	3.32	.63	3.17	.57	5.410	.000
Neuroticism	2.84	.64	2.96	.59	-4.363	.000

According to the results of the *t*-test, the sequence of personality traits is same for both groups. And there is a significant difference between ELT and ELL with respect to above variables.

With respect to Agreeableness variable ELT group is more Agreeable ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .55$) than ELL group is ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .56$). This difference is significant, $t(1843) = 6.017$, $p = 0.000$.

With respect to Openness variable ELT group is more Open to new experiences ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .54$) than ELL group is ($M = 3.47$, $SD = .60$). This difference is significant, $t(1843) = 8.469$, $p = 0.000$.

According to these statistics, the mean scores of Agreeableness and Openness are almost same for ELT group.

With respect to Conscientiousness variable ELT group is more Conscientious ($M = 3.52$, $SD = .58$) than ELL group is ($M = 3.33$, $SD = .60$). This difference is significant, $t(1843) = 7.133$, $p = 0.000$.

With respect to Extraversion variable ELT group is more Extravert ($M = 3.32$, $SD = .63$) than ELL group is ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .57$). This difference is significant, $t(1843) = 5.410$, $p = 0.000$.

With respect to Neuroticism variable ELT group is less Neurotic ($M = 2.84$, $SD = .64$) than ELL group is ($M = 2.96$, $SD = .59$). This difference is significant, $t(1843) = -4.363$, $p = 0.000$.

The sequence of the personality traits for both ELT and ELL groups is same. And the levels of Agreeableness, Openness, Conscientiousness and Extraversion of ELT group are higher (approximately 0.15-0.2 points in mean scores) than ELL group. However, Neuroticism mean score of ELT group is lower than (1.4 point in mean scores) ELL group. So, ELL group seems more neurotic than ELT group.

After the analyses of the difference between the mean scores of ELT and ELL students' personality traits, in the next research question, the difference between the means of foreign language speaking anxiety scores of them is investigated.

3. Analysis of the Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference between the means of foreign language speaking anxiety scores of ELT and ELL students?

The analysis was done through inferential statistics by using independent samples *t*-test. An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the two means (ELT-ELL) and

determine if there were differences between ELT and ELL groups in terms of foreign language speaking anxiety.

Table 13 consists of the mean scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and their significance rates of ELT-ELL students.

Table 13

Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety T-test results of ELT-ELL groups

	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	p
ELT	923	2.60	.66	9.73	.000
ELL	922	2.89	.62		

Table 13 shows the mean scores of foreign language speaking anxiety of ELT and ELL students. Analysis of the participants' answers reveal that the average speaking anxiety mean score of ELT group is lower than ELL group. In other words, ELL students seem slightly anxious in foreign language speaking than ELT students. According to the results of the *t*-tests, there is a significant difference ($t=9.73$, $p<.05$) between ELT and ELL with respect to above variable.

After the analyses of the difference between the mean scores of ELT and ELL students' foreign language speaking anxiety, the relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety, the scores of ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy are investigated in the fourth research question.

4. Analysis of the Research Question 4: Are there any significant relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy?

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. All the Sig. (2-Tailed) values for the current research question results are significant. Since this value is less than .05, there are statistically significant correlations between foreign language speaking anxiety, ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy.

In Table 14, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy are given.

Table 14

Correlations between the scores of ELT foreign language speaking anxiety, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy (n=923)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. FLSA ^a	2.60	.66	-						
2. Agreeableness ^a	3.70	.55	-.13**	-					
3. Openness ^a	3.70	.54	-.30**	.26**	-				
4. Conscientiousness ^a	3.52	.58	-.21**	.44**	.32**	-			
5. Extraversion ^a	3.32	.63	-.41**	.26**	.42**	.33**	-		
6. Neuroticism ^a	2.84	.64	.38**	-.22**	-.26**	-.31**	-.42**	-	
7. FLSSE ^b	6.20	.86	-.49**	.15**	.27**	.17**	.27**	-.13**	-

Note: a = 5-point Likert scale

b = 7-point Likert scale

** p < .01

According to Table 14, both the mean scores of Agreeableness (M = 3.70) and Openness (M = 3.70) are the same and highest among the personality traits. Moreover, the score of Conscientiousness (M = 3.52) is higher than both Extraversion (M = 3.32) and Neuroticism (M = 2.84). Besides, the lowest mean score belongs to Neuroticism (M=2.84). Similarly the mean score of FLSA (M = 2.60) is the lowest, and the mean score of FLSSE (M = 6.20) is the highest.

When the correlation coefficients are taken into consideration, all the relations between the variables are significant. While there are negative and significant relations between FLSA and Agreeableness (r = -.13, p < .01), Openness (r = -.30, p < .01), Conscientiousness (r = -.21, p < .01), Extraversion (r = -.41, p < .01) and FLSSE (r = -.49, p < .01), there is only one positive and significant relation between FLSA and Neuroticism (r = .38, p < .01). Similarly, while there are positive and significant relations between FLSSE and Agreeableness (r = .15, p < .01), Openness (r = .27, p < .01), Conscientiousness (r = .17, p < .01), Extraversion (r = .27, p < .01), there are negative and significant relations between

FLSSE and Neuroticism ($r = -.13, p < .01$) and FLSA ($r = -.49, p < .01$). All the relations of Neuroticism between other variables are negative except FLSA ($r = .38, p < .01$).

After the analyses of the relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety, the scores of ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy, the same variables are investigated for ELL group in the fifth research question.

5. Analysis of the Research Question 5: Are there any significant relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy?

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. All the Sig. (2-Tailed) values for the current research question results are significant. Since this value is less than .05, there are statistically significant correlations between foreign language speaking anxiety, ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy.

In Table 15, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy are given.

Table 15

Correlations between the scores of ELL foreign language speaking anxiety, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy (n=922)

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. FLSA ^a	2.89	.62	-						
2. Agreeableness ^a	3.54	.56	-.11**	-					
3. Openness ^a	3.47	.60	-.22**	.32**	-				
4. Conscientiousness ^a	3.33	.60	-.25**	.42**	.45**	-			
5. Extraversion ^a	3.17	.58	-.35**	.20**	.36**	.32**	-		
6. Neuroticism ^a	2.97	.60	.30**	-.28**	-.18**	-.28**	-.26**	-	
7. FLSSE ^b	5.90	.78	-.35**	.10**	.18**	.16**	.17**	-.04**	-

Note: a = 5-point Likert scale

b = 7-point Likert scale

** $p < .01$

According to Table 15, the mean scores of Agreeableness ($M = 3.54$) and Openness ($M = 3.47$) are quite similar to each other and they are the highest among the personality traits. Moreover, the score of Conscientiousness ($M = 3.33$) is higher than both Extraversion ($M = 3.17$) and Neuroticism ($M = 2.97$). Besides, the lowest mean score belongs to Neuroticism ($M = 2.97$). Similarly the mean score of FLSA ($M = 2.89$) is the lowest, and the mean score of FLSSE ($M = 5.90$) is the highest.

When the correlation coefficients are taken into consideration, all the relations between the variables are significant. While there are negative and significant relations between FLSA and Agreeableness ($r = -.11, p < .01$), Openness ($r = -.22, p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($r = -.25, p < .01$), Extraversion ($r = -.35, p < .01$) and FLSSE ($r = -.35, p < .01$), there is only one positive and significant relation between FLSA and Neuroticism ($r = .30, p < .01$). Similarly, while there are positive and significant relations between FLSSE and Agreeableness ($r = .10, p < .01$), Openness ($r = .18, p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($r = .16, p < .01$), Extraversion ($r = .17, p < .01$), there are negative and significant relations between FLSSE and Neuroticism ($r = -.04, p < .01$) and FLSA ($r = -.35, p < .01$). All the relations of Neuroticism between other variables are negative except FLSA ($r = .30, p < .01$).

After the analyses of the relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety, the scores of ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy, whether ELT students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety is investigated in next research question.

6. Analysis of the Research Question 6: Do ELT students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety?

After finding out that there are significant relations between the foreign language speaking anxiety, ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy, multiple linear regression analysis is applied to predict FLSA from personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy variables and to find out to what extent personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy affect FLSA and to explore their relations. Another aim of employing multiple regression analysis is to have a precise predictive model to reveal the relationship between several independent variables (personality traits and FLSSE) and a dependent variable (FLSA). Here, the aim is to discover how the value of FLSA is changed

while each of the personality traits and FLSSE are varied with FLSA when the other variables are remained fixed; and to discover which of the personality traits and FLSSE are related to FLSA and the pattern of these relationships for ELT group.

The results can be seen on Table 16 below:

Table 16

Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis with Personality Traits and Foreign Language Speaking Self-Efficacy as Predictor of FLSA for ELT students (n=923)

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Agreeableness	.076	.036	.063	2.127	.000***
Openness	-.073	.037	-.059	-1.979	.048*
Conscientiousness	-.022	.035	-.019	-.622	.534
Extraversion	-.192	.033	-.183	-5.813	.000***
Neuroticism	.258	.030	.249	8.462	.000***
FLSSE	-.310	.021	-.403	-14.642	.000***

$R = .620$ $R^2 = .384$

$F_{(6, 909)} = 94.43$ $p = .000$ ***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

This model is significant. The results of multiple regression analysis show that Agreeableness, Openness, Extraversion, Neuroticism and FLSSE explain approximately 38% of the total variance in FLSA for ELT students ($F(6.909) = 94.43$ $p = .000$; $R = .620$ $R^2 = .384$). The most significant predictors of FLSA for ELT students are FLSSE, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Openness respectively, so FLSSE (Beta = -.403, $t(909) = -14.642$, $p < .001$), Neuroticism (Beta = .249, $t(909) = 8.462$, $p < .001$), Extraversion (Beta = -.183, $t(909) = -5.813$, $p < .001$), Agreeableness (Beta = .063, $t(909) = 2.127$, $p < .001$) and Openness (Beta = -.059, $t(909) = -1.979$, $p < .05$) significantly predict FLSA in ELT group. Among the variables, FLSSE (Beta = -.403, $p < .001$), Extraversion (Beta = -.183, $p < .001$) and Openness (Beta = -.059, $p < .05$) have negatively significant and Neuroticism (Beta = .249, $p < .001$) and Agreeableness (Beta = .063, $p < .001$) have positively significant relations with FLSA. However, Conscientiousness (Beta = -.019, $p > .05$) is not a significant predictor of FLSA for ELT students. Among the personality traits while the most anxious ones are Neuroticism and Agreeableness, the least anxious PTs are Extraversion and Openness.

The results in Table 16 demonstrate that this model of multiple regression analysis is significant. FLSSE is the most powerful predictor of FLSA and it has a negative relation

with it. Among the five personality traits, Extraversion and Openness negatively, and Neuroticism and Agreeableness positively predict the FLSA of ELT group. This means that in ELT group, extraverted students and students open to new experiences are the least anxious speakers of English; however, neurotic and agreeable students are the most anxious English speakers. Here, it should also be noted that Extraversion is the least anxious trait, and Neuroticism is the most anxious trait for ELT group. On the other hand, Conscientiousness personality trait has a negative relation but it does not significantly predict FLSA.

After giving the results related to the sixth research question, whether ELL students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety is investigated in the seventh research question.

7. Analysis of the Research Question 7: Do ELL students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety?

After finding out that there is significant relation between the foreign language speaking anxiety, ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy, multiple linear regression analysis is applied to predict FLSA from personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy variables and to find out to what extent personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy affect FLSA and to explore their relations. Another aim of employing multiple regression analysis is to have a precise predictive model to reveal the relationship between several independent variables (personality traits and FLSSE) and a dependent variable (FLSA). Here, the aim is to discover how the value of FLSA is changed while each of the personality traits and FLSSE are varied with FLSA when the other variables are remained fixed; and to discover which of the personality traits and FLSSE are related to FLSA and the pattern of these relationships for ELL group.

The results can be seen on Table 17 below:

Table 17

Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis with Personality Traits and Foreign Language Speaking Self-Efficacy as Predictor of FLSA for ELL students (n=922)

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Agreeableness	.082	.036	.075	2.295	.022*
Openness	-.043	.035	-.042	-1.244	.214
Conscientiousness	-.097	.036	-.094	-2.704	.007**
Extraversion	-.223	.034	-.207	-6.488	.000***
Neuroticism	.230	.032	.221	7.143	.000***
FLSSE	-.233	.023	-.292	-9.937	.000***

$$R = .516 \quad R^2 = .267$$

$$F_{(6, 896)} = 54.26 \quad p = .000***$$

$$*p < .05. \quad **p < .01. \quad ***p < .001$$

This model is significant. The results of multiple regression analysis show that Agreeableness, Openness, Extraversion, Neuroticism and FLSSE explain approximately 27% of the total variance in FLSA for ELL students ($F(6, 896) = 54.26$, $p = .000$; $R = .516$, $R^2 = .267$). The most significant predictors of FLSA for ELL students are FLSSE, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness respectively, so FLSSE (Beta = $-.292$, $t(896) = -9.937$, $p < .001$), Neuroticism (Beta = $.221$, $t(896) = 7.143$, $p < .001$), Extraversion (Beta = $-.207$, $t(896) = 6.488$, $p < .001$), Conscientiousness (Beta = $-.094$, $t(896) = -2.704$, $p < .01$) and Agreeableness (Beta = $.075$, $t(896) = 2.295$, $p < .05$) significantly predict FLSA in ELL group. Among the variables, FLSSE (Beta = $-.292$, $p < .001$), Extraversion (Beta = $-.207$, $p < .001$) and Conscientiousness (Beta = $-.094$, $p < .01$) have negatively significant and Neuroticism (Beta = $.221$, $p < .001$) and Agreeableness (Beta = $.075$, $p < .05$) have positively significant relations with FLSA. However, Openness (Beta = $-.042$, $p > .05$) is not a significant predictor of FLSA for ELL students. Among the personality traits while the most anxious ones are Neuroticism and Agreeableness, the least anxious PTs are Extraversion and Conscientiousness.

The results in Table 17 demonstrate that this model of multiple regression analysis is significant. FLSSE is the most powerful predictor of FLSA and it has a negative relation with it. Among the five personality traits, Extraversion and Conscientiousness negatively, and Neuroticism and Agreeableness positively predict the FLSA of ELL group. This means that in ELL group, extraverted and conscientious students are the least anxious speakers of English; however, neurotic and agreeable students are the most anxious

English speakers. Here, it should also be noted that Extraversion is the least anxious trait, and Neuroticism is the most anxious trait for ELT group. On the other hand, Openness personality trait has a negative relation but it does not significantly predict FLSA.

As for the 6th and 7th research questions it can be asserted that although both ELT and ELL groups have all five personality traits in them, the analyses of these personality traits as predictors of anxiety in speaking a foreign language show differences according to the departments. However, this difference is significant mostly in the number of significant predictors. That is, Extraversion is the first, and Neuroticism is the last personality trait for both groups. Besides, FLSSE is the biggest predictor of FLSA for all participants. Therefore, the results of these two research questions are almost same for both ELT and ELL groups.

To sum up, the majority of the participants have Agreeableness and the participants with Neuroticism are in minority. After finding out the sequence of PTs, it is determined that there are significant differences between the mean scores of ELT and ELL students' personality traits and their foreign language speaking anxiety scores. Also significant relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety, the scores of personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy of the participants are detected. According the results, high FLSSE and Extraversion mean low FLSA and high Neuroticism means high FLSA. These results can be asserted as same for both ELT and ELL groups.

4.2 Discussion

In this section, findings and their interpretations with respect to the relevant literature will be discussed. There are three major issues investigated in this study. These are detailed below respectively.

1. The first issue is about the personality traits of 4th year students of ELT and ELL departments. Descriptive statistics was used to determine the Personality Traits (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness) of ELT and ELL groups. This analysis indicates that both groups (ELT – ELL) have all personality traits in them and it is possible to distinguish all personality traits. However, it is difficult to suggest any personality trait prevails the others in each group. No personality trait proves to be more than any other in high proportion in any group and between groups since the calculated mean scores are very close to each other. The analysis agrees additionally

that all personality traits are related to each other. The results also show that the sequence of the personality traits is same for both ELT and ELL groups. The highest construct of personality traits for both groups is Agreeableness; whereas, the others are Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Neuroticism respectively.

Since there are cognitive and non-cognitive individual differences among students and these differences have important place in development of knowledge (Furham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004), personality traits and academic success of students are also significantly related (Furham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004; Furham et al., 2003; Lounsbury et al., 2004; O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007). The findings of the current study also confirm the past research suggesting that personality traits are directly connected to academic success and academic performance and even to career success of individuals (Judge et al., 1999; Barchard, 2003; Lounsbury et al., 2004; Duff et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007).

In the current study, personality traits are ordered and sequenced almost same as in previous investigations about relationships between personality traits and academic success (Furham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004; Furham et al., 2003; Lounsbury et al., 2004; O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007; Erton, 2010), academic motivation (Clark and Schroth, 2010; Komarraju and Karau, 2005; Komarraju et al., 2009), impact of English usage (Kao and Craigie, 2014); foreign language learning (Erton, 2004; Pourfeiz, 2015); personality traits of prospective teachers (Arif et al., 2012); emotional intelligence (Homayouni, 2011); online learning motivation and satisfaction (Shih et al., 2013); learners' learning styles and language learning strategies (Erton, 2004; Asmali, 2014; Ayhan, 2016); academic performance (De Feyter et al., 2012); Social English Language Learning Strategies (SELLSs) of EFL students (Fazeli, 2012); effects of personality traits on achievement levels (Smart et al., 1970); final course grade of college students (Chastain, 1975); proficiency levels and introversion-extraversion tendencies in EFL (Busch, 1982); language learning ability differences (Robinson et al., 1994); adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism (Ulu, 2007); and end-of-training proficiency grades in an intensive training (Ehrman and Oxford, 1995).

However, in some other investigations not all personality traits are correlated positively. Although personality traits have significant relationships with foreign language learning achievement, some personality factors are negatively correlated and some are positively

correlated. Particularly, these relationships were determined inconsistent and affected by research methods (Daele et al., 2006), teaching and evaluation methods (Smart et al., 1970), culturally determined role behavior (Busch, 1982), learning and testing environments (Carrell et al., 1996), gender (Wilson and Lynn, 1990), target language (Chastain, 1975) and efficiency level (Smart et al., 1970). Besides, it was found out that learning styles and success of the learners had low correlations with personality traits (Erton, 2010).

In both groups, Agreeableness has the highest score. This finding is in accordance with the result of another study in Turkey where Agreeableness is found to be the first personality trait among university students as well (Yanardöner, 2010). Agreeableness is considered together with kindness, politeness, trustfulness, being open to cooperation and forgiving others, tender-mindedness, compliance and tolerance (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Compromising is more important than competition for people with Agreeableness (Barrick et al., 2002). Generally, they avoid conflicts among people but when it is unavoidable, they try to solve a conflict without using power (Cloninger, 2000). People with high level of Agreeableness may be more eager to interact with target language or international community (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002; Takač and Požega, 2012). Like Extraversion and Conscientiousness, Agreeableness has an important effect on academic success as well (Lounsbury et al., 2004). According to psychological research, Agreeableness is closely related to affective factors like confidence, self-esteem and experience (Watson and Clark, 1992). But in a study of Trait Descriptive Adjectives (TDA), Agreeableness was determined as one of the least reliable subscales (John and Sirivastava, 1999). However, among Turkish adults, Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness personality traits are higher than Neuroticism and Agreeableness. This can be explained by adaptation of individuals; university environment is less competitive and students are friendlier and so, Agreeableness can be accepted naturally. However, when people begin to work, competition becomes a reality and people may become more preserved in contrast to university environment. Therefore, it can be asserted that students with Agreeableness may become extravert in their workplaces. The transition in age together with social standing may result this change in dominant personality trait and there is a relation between Extraversion and adult life as well (Gülgöz, 2002). The finding of the current study is accordance with the above-mentioned finding since the participants'

average age is 22.8 and Agreeableness has the highest proportion among all personality traits.

In a study, Agreeableness and formative capabilities were correlated negatively (King et al., 1996), and Agreeableness score of women was greater than men (Rubinstein, 2005) in another study. This also may make sense for the current study since the population of the study is almost 70% female, although the variable gender was not the main focus of the current study.

Although Agreeableness comes in the first place among personality factors in the current study, it is a missing factor in a PhD study done in Japan (Apple, 2011). The Agreeableness factor was not significant with the factors of group harmony neither in Hong Kong (Lun and Bond, 2006) nor in China (Lun and Bond, 2006), but slightly correlated with Conscientiousness factor in Japan (Kashiwagi, 2002). Agreeableness also has relations somehow with affective factors like self-esteem and confidence (Watson and Clark, 1992) and with foreign language speaking (John et al., 2008).

Next highest score for both ELT and ELL groups is Openness. This finding is also in accordance with Yanardöner's (2010) study where Openness is the second personality trait among university students in Turkey. In this dimension of personality traits, the characteristics of fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas, values, open-mindedness, culture, curiosity for knowledge and to learn are prominent (Barrick and Mount, 1991). In accordance with the results of the current study, it can be asserted that both ELT-ELL participants are tolerant about the rules, reject traditional gender roles, approach exams with humorous point of views, like to experience new things (McCrae and Costa, 1985) and have big imagination, humor and originality (Friedman and Schustack, 1999). From this point of view, ELT and ELL groups are almost equally open to new experiences.

One possible reason as to why Openness is the second highest construct may be the fact that participants can build the most suitable personal relations in their environments. In psychological research, Openness is closely related to affective factors like confidence, self-esteem and experience (Watson and Clark, 1992). While people who care about others' welfare are assessed positively in Western cultures, personal relationships are hierarchical and this hierarchy starts with the language used in Turkish families. First intimate relations occur in families but as children grow up, they are presented to a network of human relations including in-group and out-of-group activities. In-group,

relations are related to individuals themselves through membership of a group like family, work or school; if there are no joint activities, those people are considered as out-of-group (Hendry, 2003). The fact that the participants are all fourth-year ELT-ELL students, i.e. seniors, means that they are the eldest in their departments. So, they know their environment well and they are halfway through their professional lives. This might prove that they have high self-confidence and marked Openness items accordingly.

However, it was found out that there was not Openness factor among Chinese students (Cheung et al., 2001), low levels of Openness was noticed in a study in Korea (Yoon et al., 2002) and the Openness factor indicated significant medium negative correlation with group harmony in a study conducted in Hong Kong (Lun and Bond, 2006). These results may prove that personality inventories belonging to Western traditions cannot be valid in Asian cultures since these cultures have higher value of interpersonal relationships than Western cultures have (Cheung et al., 2001) and it is very difficult to obtain invariance across cultures (Gülgöz, 2002).

In addition, Openness has significant correlations with different features of communicative competence (Verhoeven and Vermeer, 2002), academic success (Barchard, 2003), classroom performance and GPA (Rothstein et al., 1994), academic achievement (Laidra et al., 2007), higher scores in the SAT verbal test (Noftle and Robins, 2007), tendency in determining high learning goals (Payne et al., 2007) and engagement motivation (Komarraju and Karau, 2005). However, Openness was negatively associated with avoidance motivation (Heaven, 1990; Kanfer et al., 1996; Busato et al., 1999; De Guzman et al., 2003) and did not show any significant impact on academic success (Lounsbury et al., 2004).

The dimension Conscientiousness stands in the middle among five personality dimensions for both ELT and ELL groups. People of this dimension are disciplined, ready to cope with problems, faithful to ethical principles and values, and they are capable of fulfillment of a duty and pondering enough before acting (Neuman and Wright, 1999). Conscientiousness is one of the most reliable subscales (John and Sirivastava, 1999) and correlated negatively with Neuroticism (Rubinstein, 2005) and group harmony (Lun and Bond, 2006). Women's Conscientiousness score was greater than men's (Rubinstein, 2005) and positively correlated with self-esteem (Marlar and Joubert, 2002). Among Big Five personality traits, Conscientiousness is one of the most significant and persistent predictors of academic

achievement (Duff et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007; O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007), academic success (Barchard, 2003; Lounsbury et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007), GPA and individual scores (Duff et al., 2004; Laidra et al., 2007; Paunonen and Ashton, 2001) and grades as well (Chamorro-Premuzic and Furham, 2003; Kappe and van de Flier, 2010; Oswald et al., 2004).

The next dimension for both ELT and ELL groups is Extroversion with generally sociable, outgoing, talkative, active, easygoing and lively characteristics. Extrovert people are active, outgoing and carefree and they have more tendencies to self-disclosure (McCrae and Costa, 1985). Besides, as extrovert learners are more energetic and positive in language learning activities, they are more successful (Ehrman, 2008). They are more involved in performances (Robinson et al., 1994; Kiany, 1997; Kiany, 1998) and foreign language teachers have been in favor of this point as well (Gregersen, 2003; Zhang, 2009). Superiority and wish for prizewinning are among the motivational factors for extrovert people (Barrick et al., 2002). Extroversion is asserted to be quite similar to Conscientiousness and Agreeableness (Bond et al., 1975) and closely related to Neuroticism (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985; McCrae and Costa, 1987; Costa and McCrae, 1992). Like Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, Extraversion has an important effect on academic success (Lounsbury et al., 2004). It also reveals the biggest correlation between affect and personality (Yik et al., 2002), has effect on oral fluency, complexity and accuracy (Daele et al., 2006) and is directly related with foreign language speaking (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996; Apple, 2011). Besides, according to a study among English instructors, a strong relation is detected between Extroversion - Introversion personality traits and negotiation styles (Gürsel, 2009) and a positive correlation is found out between Extroversion and negotiation strategy of integrating (Yürür, 2009). This finding of the current study is in accordance with a previous study where it is found out that extravert participants start conversations, introduce new topics, make restatements and build longer sentences while introverts ask questions (Abalı, 2006) in classroom.

And the lowest score for both ELT and ELL groups is Neuroticism whose characteristics are assumed as vulnerability, self-consciousness, depression, impulsiveness, angry hostility and anxiety (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Neurotic people are very angry, tense, anxious, depressive and worried, have difficulties to build and sustain healthy relations with people and they live longtime stress and tend to live negative emotions for long times and develop

some behavior pathologies (Bruck and Allen, 2003). Neuroticism means nervousness and emotional consistency and so, neurotic people are defined as more affective, tense, depressive, timid and uneasy with low self-confidence than others (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). These are the negative factors affecting foreign language speaking, and it is seen in the current study that both ELT and ELL groups have Neuroticism trait at the least. However, the results show that this is the smallest dimension of personality traits for both ELT and ELL groups. This can be a positive stimulant and a good thing for both ELT and ELL groups to have least Neuroticism, since many negative items and personality problems of people are reflected in Neuroticism (Digman, 1990). Therefore, it can be asserted that both groups have negative items and personality problems which may help them be good English learners. It is also good to have low levels of Neuroticism because in a recent study by Kao (2012) the findings show that EFL success is negatively affected by Neuroticism and in another study, it did not show any significant impact on academic success (Lounsbury et al., 2004). Therefore, it can be suggested that Neuroticism is related to poor EFL success incidentally.

2. The second issue investigated in the current study is about the difference between the mean scores of ELT and ELL students' personality traits. In order to determine the potential associations between the variables and to investigate the statistical relation between the personality traits of ELT and ELL groups, independent samples *t*-test was applied. The aim was to compare the two means (ELT-ELL) and determine if there were differences between ELT and ELL groups in terms of Personality Traits (Agreeableness, Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Neuroticism). The findings show that although the sequence does not change depending on the group, there is a significant difference between ELT and ELL with respect to personality traits. And the levels of Agreeableness, Openness, Conscientiousness and Extraversion of ELT group are higher (approximately 0.15-0.2 points in mean scores) than ELL group. However, Neuroticism mean score of ELT group is lower than (1.4 point in mean scores) ELL group. So, ELL group seems more neurotic than ELT group. And according to these statistics, the mean scores of Agreeableness and Openness are almost same for ELT group.

The result of the comparison of ELT and ELL departments shows that all variables except Neuroticism are higher in ELT group than they are in ELL group, although the sequence of variables is same. The results of Agreeableness ($M = 3.69$), Openness ($M = 3.69$),

Conscientiousness ($M = 3.52$) and Extraversion ($M = 3.32$) for ELT group are higher than the results of Agreeableness ($M = 3.54$), Openness ($M = 3.47$), Conscientiousness ($M = 3.33$) and Extraversion ($M = 3.17$) for the ELL group. On the other hand, the result of Neuroticism ($M = 2.84$) for ELT group is lower than the result Neuroticism ($M = 2.96$) for ELL group. Although the scores for these variables are slightly different from each other for each group, they are all significant.

These results seem to suggest that ELT group is more agreeable, more open to new experiences, more conscientious, more extraverted but less neurotic than ELL group. Since there are cognitive and non-cognitive individual differences among students and these differences have important place in development of knowledge (Furham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004), personality traits and academic success of students are also significantly related (Furham and Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004; Furham et al., 2003; O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007). The findings of the current study also confirm the past research suggesting that personality traits are directly connected to academic success and academic performance and vice versa (Barchard, 2003; Duff et al., 2004; Lounsbury et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007). The higher results of ELT group except Neuroticism than ELL group may prove their inclination of better academic success and academic performance and their lower result of Neuroticism may suggest their lower foreign language speaking anxiety and higher foreign language speaking self-efficacy than ELL group.

3. The third issue investigated in the current study is about the difference between the means of foreign language speaking anxiety scores of ELT and ELL students. Through independent samples *t*-test the two FLSA means (ELT-ELL) were compared and differences between ELT and ELL groups in terms of foreign language speaking anxiety were investigated. The *t*-test result reveals that there is a significant difference ($t=9.73$, $p < .05$) between ELT and ELL with respect to their foreign language speaking anxiety scores.

This finding shows that FLSA mean score of ELT group ($M = 2.60$) is lower than FLSA mean score of ELL group ($M = 2.89$). In other words, ELL students are a little more anxious in foreign language speaking than ELT students and ELT group students are less anxious about speaking English than ELL group students. This result is in accordance with another investigation on Turkish students where the participants observe English speaking as an anxiety provoking factor (Öztürk and Gürbüz, 2014).

This can be explained by the types of selves and self-identities (Markus and Nurius, 1986; Higgins, 1987) and their reflections on ELT and ELL groups; from the very beginning of their university lives ELT students are supposed to be English language teachers, so the ideal teacher self is very important for them. This ideal teacher-self forms English teachers' future aspirations and future images of identity goals and urges them to have ideal teaching selves instead of their actual teaching selves (Higgins et al., 1994; Kubanyiova, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2009). Also, the ideal teacher-self is supposed to motivate ELT students to struggle for their ideal teaching selves. This process of trying to become an ideal teacher may help reduce foreign language speaking anxiety of ELT students in comparison with ELL students, because speaking in English during teaching process is highly demanded and an obligation for an English teacher. However, there may not be such an obligation or requirement for ELL students since they are not basically supposed to become English language teachers.

The second reason that might reduce the foreign language speaking anxiety of ELT students may be ought-to language teacher self (Higgins, 1987). English teachers have some responsibilities and obligations regarding their work; and during teaching process, speaking English is among the first duties expected from an English teacher. Ought-to language teacher self represents these obligations, responsibilities and duties which are generally based on someone else's point of view. Every English teacher must believe s/he should have some characteristics and traits to be an ideal teacher and these expectations are generally imposed on her/him extrinsically by institutions, people around her/him, professional ethics, administration or inspection. These representations of responsibilities and expectations of others all refer to ought-to language teacher self, which can be accepted as another stimulation for English teachers to speak English while teaching and to reduce their foreign language speaking anxiety. However, ELL students may not feel these obligations and this may hinder their speaking abilities and increase their anxiety during speaking English.

The third reason that might reduce the foreign language speaking anxiety of ELT students may be the avoidance of feared language teacher self (Higgins et al., 1994; Kubanyiova, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2009). It refers to lack of ideal and ought-to language teacher selves and professional capabilities as a result of inadequate vocational education and training experiences. The main ability that is expected from an English teacher is to speak in

English and the opposite of this is inability to speak in English. Moreover, not being able to speak English is an unwanted future self for an English teacher and it should be avoided at all costs. Since ELT students are English teachers candidates and know that they are supposed to speak at their work, they may avoid feared language teacher self and have to achieve the ability to speak English during their education in order not to face the unwanted situations in their future career.

The fourth reason that might reduce the foreign language speaking anxiety of ELT students may be the obligation to prepare themselves for professional teacher self (Demirezen, 2015j). Career in foreign language teaching is accepted as one of the most complicated jobs nowadays since an English teacher is a teacher and a student at the same time. Besides, English teachers need various qualities to perform their jobs effectively. Professional teacher self requires knowledge, confidence and it is built up throughout the teaching career. However, it starts during university education. The avoidance of the feared language teacher self and achievement of ideal and ought to language teacher selves should prepare ELT students for professional teacher self, because professional teacher-self necessitates a near native-like English speaking with good pronunciation and ELT students will need speaking ability during their teaching.

From the very beginning of their education ELT students are motivated to become teachers. Their curriculum is in accordance with this aim. In most of their subjects they need to speak and make presentations in front of their peers. Therefore, speaking is emphasized a lot besides the other skills. There are two semesters of teaching practice at schools where the ELT students observe other English teachers, help them and teach some hours in real classrooms as well. All these opportunities may contribute positively to ELT students' English speaking abilities and affect their foreign language speaking anxiety negatively and lower it. However, ELL students do not have these obligations and the opportunities to practice their English so much.

4. The fourth issue investigated in the current study is about significant relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. These relations were investigated through Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and statistically significant correlations were detected between foreign language speaking anxiety, ELT

personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. All the Sig. (2-Tailed) values for this research question results were significant.

When the mean scores of the PTs are considered, Agreeableness and Openness have the same and the highest scores among the personality traits for ELT group. Moreover, Neuroticism has the lowest mean score. And Conscientiousness is higher than both Extraversion and Neuroticism. Similarly, FLSA has the lowest, and FLSSE has the highest mean scores among the variables.

According to the correlation coefficients of ELT group, the relation of each variable with the others is significant. From the highest, respectively FLSSE, Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness have negative and significant relations with FLSA. Regarding to PTs, these findings indicate that extravert students are the least anxious English speakers. After extravert ones, students who are open to new experiences are the least anxious foreign language speakers. In the third place, the conscientious students exist. Agreeableness personality trait is the last one which correlates negatively with FLSA. This means that students with Agreeableness are the most anxious English speakers among the students with other three negatively correlated PTs (Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness). Therefore, agreeable students are only less anxious foreign language speakers than the neurotic ones. And only Neuroticism has a positive and significant relation with FLSA. This result means that the most anxious English speakers are the neurotic students.

Therefore, according to these findings it can be suggested that the more extravert, open to new experiences, conscientious and agreeable people are, the less anxious English speakers they are; and the more neurotic people are, the more anxious English speakers they are.

Regarding the FLSSE, the results indicate the existence of five personality traits (Agreeableness, Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Neuroticism) for the participants. From the highest, respectively Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness have positive and significant relations with FLSSE. Regarding the FLSSE, these findings indicate that extravert students and students who are open to new experiences are the most self-efficient English speakers. After extravert and open to new experiences ones, conscientious students are the most self-efficient speakers. Although its score is very close to the score of Conscientiousness, Agreeableness personality trait is the last one which correlates positively with FLSSE. This means that students with

Agreeableness are the least self-efficient foreign language speakers among the students with other three positively correlated PTs (Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness). Therefore, agreeable students are only more self-efficient foreign language speakers than the neurotic ones. And among the PTs, only Neuroticism has a negative and significant relation with FLSSE. Actually, Neuroticism has negative relations with all variables except FLSA. This result means that the least self-efficient English speakers are the neurotic students. And the seventh variable, FLSA, has a negative and significant relation with FLSSE. This means that people with high level of foreign language speaking anxiety feel less self-efficient in speaking English.

Therefore, according to these findings it can be suggested that the more extravert, open to new experiences, conscientious and agreeable people are, the more self-efficient English speakers they are; and the more neurotic people are, the less self-efficient English speakers they are.

5. The fifth issue investigated in the current study is about significant relationships between the scores of foreign language speaking anxiety and both the scores of ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. These relations were investigated through Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and statistically significant correlations were detected between foreign language speaking anxiety, ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. All the Sig. (2-Tailed) values for this research question results were significant.

The mean scores of the PTs show that Agreeableness and Openness have almost same and the highest scores among the personality traits for ELL group. Moreover, Neuroticism has the lowest mean score. And Conscientiousness is higher than both Extraversion and Neuroticism. Similarly, FLSA has the lowest and FLSSE has the highest mean scores among the variables. These results overlap with the result of ELT group as well.

According to the correlation coefficients of ELL group, all the relations between the variables are significant. From the highest, respectively FLSSE, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness and Agreeableness have negative and significant relations with FLSA. Regarding to PTs, these findings indicate that extravert students are the least anxious English speakers. After extravert ones, conscientious students are the least anxious foreign language speakers. In the third place, the students who are open to new experiences exist. Agreeableness personality trait is the last one which correlates negatively with

FLSA. This means that students with Agreeableness are the most anxious English speakers among the students with other three negatively correlated PTs (Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness). Therefore, agreeable students are only less anxious foreign language speakers than the neurotic ones. And only Neuroticism has a positive and significant relation with FLSA. This result means that the most anxious English speakers are the neurotic students.

Therefore, according to these findings it can be suggested that the more extravert, conscientious, open to new experiences and agreeable people are, the less anxious English speakers they are; and the more neurotic people are, the more anxious English speakers they are.

Besides, from the highest respectively Openness, Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness have positive and significant relations with FLSSE. However, the mean scores of three PTs, Openness, Extraversion, Conscientiousness are very close to each other. Regarding to FLSSE, these findings indicate that students who are open to new experiences are the most self-efficient English speakers. After them, extravert and conscientious students are the most self-efficient speakers. And Agreeableness personality trait is the last one which correlates positively with FLSSE. This means that students with Agreeableness are the least self-efficient foreign language speakers among the students with other three positively correlated PTs (Openness, Extraversion and Conscientiousness). Therefore, agreeable students are only more self-efficient foreign language speakers than the neurotic ones. And among the PTs, only Neuroticism has a negative and significant relation with FLSSE. Actually, Neuroticism has negative relations with all variables except FLSA. This result means that the least self-efficient English speakers are the neurotic students. And the seventh variable, FLSA, has a negative and significant relation with FLSSE. This means that people with high level of foreign language speaking self-efficacy feel less anxiety in speaking English.

Regarding the issues in 4th and 5th research questions, it is determined that all personality traits have significant relations with FLSA and FLSSE for both ELT and ELL groups. Therefore, it is also determined that all five personality traits are related to FLSA and FLSSE to some extent. There are positive significant relations between all personality traits except Neuroticism because Neuroticism has negative relations with the other four traits. This finding agrees with another investigation where the same result is found out

(Öner, 2012) but does not agree with another investigation where personality traits did not have a significant relation with foreign language learning anxiety of learners (Köksal et al., 2014). And four of the five personality traits, Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness have positive relations and the fifth, Neuroticism has negative relation with FLSSE. This means the more extravert, open to new experiences, conscientious and agreeable the participants are, the more they feel self-efficient. Similarly, the more neurotic the participants are, the less self-efficient they feel. So, except Neuroticism, the other four personality traits affect FLSSE positively. This finding agrees with another finding that together with personality, anxiety is an affective variable related to foreign language learning (Öztürk and Gürbüz, 2013).

Among the personality traits, Extraversion and Neuroticism attract attention for FLSSE. Extraversion is one of the personality traits which has a positive relation with FLSSE, although it is the fourth personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. This means that extravert participants are not in majority but they are the foreign language speakers with high foreign language speaking self-efficacy. Thus, the more extravert a person is, the more self-efficient s/he is in speaking a foreign language. And Neuroticism is the fifth personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. This means that neurotic participants are in minority but they are the least self-efficient foreign language speakers. And besides, Neuroticism is the only personality trait which has a negative relation with FLSSE; this means the more neurotic a person is, the less self-efficient s/he is in speaking a foreign language. This finding of the current study also proves the close relation between Extraversion and Neuroticism (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985; McCrae and Costa, 1987). Also the biggest correlation between affect and personality exists in Extraversion and Neuroticism (Yik et al., 2002) and self-esteem is negatively correlated with Neuroticism while it is positively correlated with Extraversion (Marlar and Joubert, 2002). Besides, the current study is not in accordance with the investigation on Korean participants where Extraversion is detected lower and Neuroticism is detected higher (Yoon et al., 2002).

According to Costa and McCrae (1992), the domain Extraversion is known with positive emotions, activity, warmth, excitement-seeking, gregariousness and assertiveness and because of these, people with Extraversion are interested in external world a lot, stimulation and friendship. The trait Extraversion was found out as a self-efficient

personality trait for the participants in the current study. Although Extroversion has direct relationship with foreign language speaking self-efficacy, its relation with foreign language speaking anxiety is weak; so, the more learners are extraverted, the more they are self-efficient and the less they are anxious about speaking English. This can be explained as extroverted learners are more involved in tasks in their classes and as a result of this involvement, their speaking self-efficacy may become higher and their FLSA may become lower. So, Extroversion can be asserted to be directly related with FLSSE and FLSA.

This also indicates that highly extraverted university students have higher self-efficacy in foreign language speaking than less extraverted students in Turkey; they are the most self-efficient group when they speak in English. In other words, the active and social students can have higher self-efficacy in foreign language speaking and can speak English better than their classmates with other personality traits. This can also suggest that highly extraverted students may reduce their anxiety, stabilize their emotions and give encouragement to themselves when necessary and so, may increase their foreign language speaking self-efficacy. Likewise, they are open for cooperation with their peers and more willing to ask questions in their language classes. These findings are in accordance with the result of another study in Turkey where Extraversion is negatively correlated with hopelessness (Akbağ and Göktan, 2010) and with loneliness (Atak, 2009) and with the findings of another investigation that decreased impulse control and distraction affect loneliness by means of personality (Günay, 2011). However, together with Conscientiousness, Extraversion has a positive relation with subjective well-being (Malkoç, 2011).

Therefore, all these factors may affect learners' speaking self-efficacy in a positive way and increase their speaking self-efficacy as well. These results agree with results of MacIntyre and Charos, (1996) and Apple (2011) that Extroversion is directly related with foreign language speaking self-efficacy and extroverted learners are the most self-efficient foreign language speakers.

The result of the current study also aligns with the results of Alishah (2015) that the majority of the students are moderately extraverted in Turkey. This finding also supports that for the participants Extraversion and Openness are the most significant predictors of FLSSE and a positive contribution for speaking self-efficacy and high level of Extroversion may improve foreign language speaking self-efficacy (Apple, 2011).

Openness is another personality trait which has a positive relation with FLSSE in the current study, as it is the second personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs as well. It can also be suggested that the more open to new experiences a person is, the more self-efficient s/he is in speaking a foreign language. This result agrees with Kashiwagi's (2002) result that Openness is correlated with Extraversion. From this point of view, the results of foreign language speaking self-efficacy have parallelism with the results of speaking anxiety. According to MacIntyre and Charos (1996) and Apple (2011), Openness may increase speaking self-efficacy and high Openness level may result in high speaking self-efficacy. This explains the higher proportion of Openness personality trait among the participants. This high Openness result of the current study can be accepted as very normal since Openness is closely related to affective factors like confidence, self-esteem and experience (Watson and Clark, 1992). Besides, similar to the current study, Openness is the highest among personality traits in some investigations (Arif et al., 2012) and it is positively correlated with speaking (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996; Apple, 2011) and learning English (Homayouni, 2011). This finding in the current study on the relation of Openness with FLSSE is in accordance with the majority of previous findings since Openness has significant relations with academic achievement (Laidra et al., 2007), strong learning goal orientation (Payne et al., 2007) and GPA of the students (Rothstein et al., 1994).

Openness is significantly correlated with FLSSE in the current study; therefore, it can be suggested that participants are open-minded, curious about their environment and they value originality. They can be accepted as learners through interaction while they regulate their emotions, so this helps them increase their self-efficacy. Besides, their interests lie in various things; and also art, music and literature are important for them and Openness has relations with self-esteem and confidence (Watson and Clark, 1992) and with different features of communicative competence (Verhoeven and Vermeer's, 2002); because of all these reasons, high Openness may have important influence on foreign language speaking.

Moreover, the high correlation of Openness with FLSSE in the current study may be explained with the fact that there is a positive contribution of Openness for motivation of engagement and there is a negative relation between Openness with FLSSE for feeling towards learning (Komarraju and Karau, 2005). Moreover, this finding of the current study agrees with Homayouni's (2011) finding that there is a positive correlation between

English learning and Openness. However, contrary to Agreeableness and Neuroticism, Openness has a negative relation with academic self-regulation and self-efficacy (Şenler, 2011).

Conscientiousness is another personality trait after Openness which has a positive relation with FLSSE in the current study, as it is the third personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. This result means that participants with Conscientiousness feel self-efficient foreign language speakers. Thus, the more conscientious a person is, the more self-efficient s/he is in speaking a foreign language. Conscientiousness means being organized and disciplined and the students with high Conscientiousness are more ready to learn and have good study habits and as a result of these facts, they have better results in English. This finding on Conscientiousness in the current study is in accordance with another investigation that Conscientiousness has strong indirect impact on foreign language speaking (Apple, 2011).

Conscientiousness personality trait dimension is related to educational success measurements and so, it is considered as dutifulness, achievement striving, deliberation, self-discipline, competence and order (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Conscientious people are generally controlled in society and their goals in life are very important for them. The finding of current study is in accordance with some other studies that there are also a positive correlation between it and Agreeableness but a negative correlation between it and Neuroticism (Rubinstein, 2005).

In the current study, there is a moderate level of positive significant correlation of Conscientiousness with FLSSE among the Turkish university students. This finding of the current study suggests that self-disciplined, well-organized and reliable Turkish university students are biased to be more self-efficient in speaking English than those negligent, undependable and disorganized ones. This result agrees with the definition which describes the Conscientiousness as socially control of oneself promoting target and duty directed attitude (John and Srivastava, 1999). Besides, this finding on the Conscientiousness is in accordance with the majority of previous findings that Conscientiousness has positive significant relations with academic achievement (O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007; Duff et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007; Barchard, 2003), with academic success (Barchard, 2003; Lounsbury et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007), with GPA, with individual score (Paunonen and Ashton, 2001; Laidra et al., 2007; Duff et al., 2004) and with grades as well

(Chamorro-Premuzic and Furham, 2003; Oswald et al., 2004; Kappe and van de Flier, 2010). Similarly, these findings can also prove that highly conscientious Turkish students may be better in their academic studies than lowly conscientious Turkish students. Moreover, the significant correlation between Conscientiousness and FLSSE may be obtained because Conscientiousness contributes positively to motivation of achievement; it has a negative relation with feeling towards learning (Komarraju and Karau, 2005); and there are significant correlations between Conscientiousness and different features of communicative competence (Verhoeven and Vermeer's, 2002). Besides, Conscientiousness has a negative relation with hopelessness (Akbağ and Göktan, 2010). But together with Extraversion, Conscientiousness has a positive relation with subjective well-being (Malkoç, 2011).

The findings of the current study on goals and tasks are also in accordance with the findings that high conscientious students are the strongest learning goal oriented ones (Payne et al., 2007), because it is determined that the majority of the conscientious participants are highly dedicated to their tasks, goals and duties and they make plans before acting to do their tasks precisely. This result also agrees with the investigation where a positive correlation between Conscientiousness and self-esteem has been detected (Marlar and Joubert, 2002).

Agreeableness is another personality after Conscientiousness trait which has a positive relation with FLSSE in the current study, although it is the first personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. According to the analysis, a significant relation between Agreeableness and FLSSE has been detected. Agreeableness, which represents cooperation and sympathizing with others, is the last personality trait positively correlating with FLSSE. It is associated with trustfulness, politeness, tolerance, compliance, compassion, tender-mindedness and cooperation towards other individuals (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Agreeableness is described as altruist, tender minded, trustful and modest traits causing cooperative direction to other people with antipathy, therefore people with high Agreeableness are generally cooperative, caring and friendly while people with low Agreeableness are suspicious, rude and critical (John and Srivastava, 1999).

There is a significant correlation between Agreeableness and FLSSE in the current study. This finding can be interpreted that Turkish university students give importance to other individuals; they are humanitarian and ready to help people and cooperate with them. This

result agrees with the fact that Agreeableness is highly related to confidence, self-esteem and experience (Watson and Clark, 1992). Therefore, it can be suggested that participants with Agreeableness are less self-efficient foreign language speakers than conscientious ones but more self-efficient foreign language speakers than the neurotic ones. Thus, the more agreeable a person is, the more self-efficient s/he is in speaking a foreign language than a neurotic person, but s/he is less self-efficient than a person with the other personalities. This relation with Conscientiousness can be remarkable because Conscientiousness is slightly correlated with Agreeableness (Kashiwagi's, 2002). Moreover, this result is in accordance with previous studies that Agreeableness is negatively related to classroom performance and has a negative relationship with GPA (Rothstein et al., 1994) and loneliness (Atak, 2009) but a positive relationship with hopelessness (Akbağ and Gökten, 2010); and Agreeableness is positively related to academic self-regulation and self-efficacy (Şenler, 2011) as well.

Similarly, there are a positive correlation between Agreeableness with Conscientiousness and Openness but a negative correlation with Neuroticism (Rubinstein, 2005) as there is in the current study and again a negative correlation between Agreeableness and formative capabilities (King et al., 1996). This finding of the current study is in accordance with finding of Homayouni (2011) that there is a positive correlation between English learning and Agreeableness.

Neuroticism is the only personality trait which has a negative relation with FLSSE and it is the fifth personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. This means that neurotic participants are in minority but they are the least self-efficient foreign language speakers. Thus, the more neurotic a person is, the less self-efficient s/he is in speaking a foreign language and neurotic students are the least self-efficient English speakers in the current study.

Neuroticism is related to nervousness, depression, being timid and uneasy accompanied by low self-confidence (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). And such an anxious and nervous state can prevent neurotic learners from language activities and tasks in foreign language classrooms and this may negatively affect their FLSSE. Accordingly, lower neuroticism may lead to higher speaking self-efficacy in language classes. This result agrees with the finding of investigation by Apple (2011) that foreign language speaking self-efficacy is influenced by Neuroticism moderately.

It is found out that Neuroticism and Extraversion have a strong relation with affect (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985; Costa and McCrae, 1992) and are in close relation with each other (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985; McCrae and Costa, 1987). This result also agrees with John and Srivastava's (1999) results on different personality questionnaires scales which support Neuroticism and Extraversion; with Yoon et al.'s (2002) study which detects high Neuroticism; and Yik et al.'s (2002) study which reveals the biggest correlation between affect and personality. Besides, Neuroticism is positively related to motivation of avoidance and this may cause negative feeling towards learning (Komarraju and Karau, 2005) and this may mean low self-efficacy in English speaking as well. Besides, together with Agreeableness, Neuroticism is positively correlated with hopelessness (Akbağ and Gökten, 2010) and loneliness (Atak, 2009) but it has a negative relation with subjective well-being (Malkoç, 2011). Moreover, together with Agreeableness, Neuroticism is positively related to academic self-regulation and self-efficacy (Şenler, 2011). And together with Extroversion – Introversion, Neuroticism is strongly correlated with negotiation styles (Gürsel, 2009).

These results show that most of the neurotic Turkish university students have bad temper and they are nervous. This result is in accordance with the idea that there is a relation among illogical, affective behaviors and low self-respect (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975) and there is a negative relation between Neuroticism and self-esteem (Marlar and Joubert, 2002). Moreover, most of the neurotic participants can worry easily and they can easily be upset, and this result is in accordance with previous findings that there is a high correlation between affect and personality (Yik et al., 2002) and Neuroticism explains this. Neuroticism has vulnerability, self-consciousness, depression, impulsiveness, angry hostility and anxiety characteristics (Barrick and Mount, 1991) and a lot of negative items and personality problems of people echo in Neuroticism (Digman, 1990). These previous findings may explain the low self-efficacy in English speaking for the current study as well. Neuroticism has also a negative relation with FLSSE. This means that high Neuroticism hinders self-efficacy and the participants who feel themselves self-efficient English speakers are fewer than the participants with other personalities. This finding on high Neuroticism is in accordance with a study where high Neuroticism is defined in Korea (Yoon et al., 2002).

Therefore, according to these results, it can be suggested that the more open to new experiences, extravert, conscientious and agreeable people are, the more self-efficient English speakers they are; and the more neurotic people are, the less self-efficient English speakers they are. And regarding the relation between FLSSE and FLSA, an inverse relation between anxiety and self-efficacy was detected as well. So, low anxiety level means high self-efficacy level while high anxiety level means low self-efficacy level. This finding is in accordance with Tsai (2013) who has found a negative and strong relation with English self-efficacy and English class anxiety.

6. The sixth issue investigated in the current study is about whether ELT students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety. After finding out the statistically significant correlations between foreign language speaking anxiety, ELT personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy, multiple linear regression analysis is conducted to predict foreign language speaking anxiety from personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy variables and to what extent this prediction exists. Besides, how each personality trait is varied with FLSA, which personality traits are related to FLSA and what the pattern of their relationships are also investigated.

The results in Table 16 demonstrate that this model of multiple regression analysis is significant and the variables explain approximately 38% of the total variance in FLSA for ELT students. FLSSE ($\beta = -.403$) is the most powerful predictor of FLSA and it has a negative relation with it. Among the five personality traits, Extraversion ($\beta = -.183$) and Openness ($\beta = -.059$) negatively, and Neuroticism ($\beta = .249$) and Agreeableness ($\beta = .063$) positively predict the FLSA of ELT group. This means that in ELT group, extraverted students and students open to new experiences are the least anxious speakers of English; however, neurotic and agreeable students are the most anxious English speakers. Here, it should also be noted that Extraversion is the least anxious trait, and Neuroticism is the most anxious trait for ELT group. On the other hand, Conscientiousness personality trait does not significantly predict FLSA. The results reveal that there are significant relations between personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy and anxiety in speaking a foreign language of participants with respect to above-mentioned variables.

Based on these results, it is not difficult to separate the personality trait constructs from each other. The results support the existence of all personality traits for ELT group except

Conscientiousness in current study. Regarding the FLSA, the results indicate the existence of FLSSE together with four personality traits (Extraversion, Openness, Neuroticism and Agreeableness) for the participants.

It is also determined that four personality traits are related to FLSA for ELT to some extent. Two of the five personality traits, Extraversion and Openness have negative relations and the two, Agreeableness and Neuroticism have positive relation with FLSA. This means the more extravert and open to new experiences the participants are, the less anxious they are. Similarly, the more neurotic and agreeable the participants are, the more anxious they are. This means that except Neuroticism and Agreeableness, the other two personality traits affect FLSA negatively.

Foreign language speaking self-efficacy ($\beta = -.403$) is the first variable which has a negative relation with FLSA in ELT group. This means that the participants with high FLSSE are the least anxious foreign language speakers. Thus, the more people feel self-efficient in speaking English, the less they are anxious in speaking a foreign language as well. This finding is in accordance with the literature that foreign language speaking self-efficacy has close relations with foreign language speaking anxiety because affect and affective factors influence foreign language speaking importantly (Watson and Clark, 1992).

FLSSE is also closely related to learners' proficiency levels and their proficiency levels have great influence on their FLSSE and FLSA as well. When learners' proficiency levels increase, their FLSSE may also increase, but their foreign language speaking anxiety may decrease. Therefore, it can be suggested that there is a negative relation between FLSSE and FLSA; this result of the current study is in accordance with previous studies because when speaking anxiety increases speaking self-efficacy decreases and vice versa (Saito and Samimy, 1996).

7. The seventh issue investigated in the current study is about whether ELL students' personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy scores significantly predict their foreign language speaking anxiety. After finding out the statistically significant correlations between foreign language speaking anxiety, ELL personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy, multiple linear regression analysis is conducted to predict foreign language speaking anxiety from personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy variables and to what extent this prediction exists. Besides, how each

personality trait is varied with FLSA, which personality traits are related to FLSA and what the pattern of their relationships are also investigated.

The results in Table 17 demonstrate that this model of multiple regression analysis is significant and the variables explain approximately 27% of the total variance in FLSA for ELL students. FLSSE ($\beta = -.292$) is the most powerful predictor of FLSA and it has a negative relation with it. Among the five personality traits, Extraversion ($\beta = -.207$) and Conscientiousness ($\beta = -.094$) negatively, and Neuroticism ($\beta = .221$) and Agreeableness ($\beta = .075$) positively predict the FLSA of ELL group. This means that in ELL group extraverted and conscientious students are the least anxious speakers of English; however, neurotic and agreeable students are the most anxious English speakers. Here, it should also be noted that Extraversion is the least anxious trait and Neuroticism is the most anxious trait for ELL group. On the other hand, Openness personality trait does not significantly predict FLSA. The results reveal that there are significant relations between personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy and anxiety in speaking a foreign language of participants with respect to above-mentioned variables.

Based on these results, it is not difficult to separate the personality trait constructs from each other. The results support the existence of all personality traits for ELL group except Openness in current study. Regarding the FLSA, the results indicated the existence of FLSSE together with four personality traits (Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Agreeableness) for the participants.

It is also determined that four personality traits are related to FLSA for ELL to some extent. Two of the five personality traits, Extraversion and Conscientiousness have negative relations and the two, Agreeableness and Neuroticism have positive relation with FLSA. This means the more extravert and conscientious the participants are, the less anxious they are. Similarly, the more neurotic and agreeable the participants are, the more anxious they are. This means that except Neuroticism and Agreeableness, the other two personality traits affect FLSA negatively.

Again also foreign language speaking self-efficacy ($\beta = -.292$) is the first variable which has a negative relation with FLSA in ELL group. This means that the participants with high FLSSE are the least anxious foreign language speakers in ELL group as well. Thus, the more people feel self-efficient in speaking English, the less they are anxious in speaking a foreign language as well. This finding is in accordance with the literature that

foreign language speaking self-efficacy has close relations with foreign language speaking anxiety because affect and affective factors influence foreign language speaking importantly (Watson and Clark, 1992). FLSSE is also closely related to learners' proficiency levels and their proficiency levels have great influence on their FLSSE and FLSA as well. When learners' proficiency levels increase, their FLSSE may also increase but their foreign language speaking anxiety may decrease. Therefore, it can be suggested that there is a negative relation between FLSSE and FLSA; this result of the current study is in accordance with previous studies because when speaking anxiety increases speaking self-efficacy (Saito and Samimy, 1996) and foreign language learning motivation decrease (Öztürk, 2012) and vice versa. This finding also agrees with another finding of a study that there is a high negative correlation between anxiety and self-confidence and students with high self-confidence take part in language activities more than their anxious peers (Kaya, 1995).

Regarding the issues in 6th and 7th research questions, it is determined that FLSSE and four of the five personality traits significantly predict FLSA for both ELT and ELL groups. However, Conscientiousness for ELT group and Openness for ELL group do not predict FLSA significantly, although they have negative relations with FLSA. This means that not all but only four personality traits can predict FLSA to some extent. Two of the five personality traits have negative relations and two personality traits have positive relations for each group. In both groups, Neuroticism and Agreeableness have positive relations with FLSA. This means that the more agreeable and neurotic people are, the more anxiety they feel in English speaking. After FLSSE, Extraversion is the only personality trait for both groups as the highest predictor of FLSA which has a negative relation with it as well. Therefore, it can be suggested that extravert people feel the least anxiety in speaking English. Openness in ELT group and Conscientiousness in ELL group are the second personality traits with negative relations with FLSA. This means the more extravert, open to new experiences and conscientious the participants are, the less anxious they are in speaking English. Similarly, the more neurotic and agreeable the participants are, the more anxiety they feel. Accordingly, except Neuroticism and Agreeableness, the other three personality traits affect FLSA negatively.

For all participants Extraversion and Neuroticism attract more attention for FLSA among the personality traits. Extraversion is the first personality trait which has a negative relation

with FLSA, although it is the fourth personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. This means that extravert participants are not in majority but they are the least anxious foreign language speakers. Thus, the more extravert people are, the less anxious they are in speaking a foreign language. And Neuroticism is the fifth and the last personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. This means that neurotic participants are in minority but they are the most anxious foreign language speakers. Besides together with Agreeableness, Neuroticism is one of the two personality traits which has a positive relation with FLSA; this means the more neurotic a person is, the more anxious s/he is in speaking a foreign language.

This finding on Extraversion and Neuroticism is in accordance with some researchers in psychology that Extraversion and Neuroticism are closely related to each other (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985; McCrae and Costa, 1987). Besides, according to Marlar and Joubert (2002), Extraversion is positively correlated with self-esteem, while Neuroticism is negatively correlated with it. Also according to an investigation of Yik et al. (2002), Extraversion and Neuroticism have the biggest correlation between affect and personality.

The current study on Turkish students disagrees with personality trait studies in Korea where Extraversion is lower and Neuroticism is higher, since Korean participants may be more modest and they may think they can do less than their peers, maybe because of Confucian ethic (Yoon et al., 2002). Besides, Extraversion has a negative relation with examination grades (Chamorro-Premuzic and Furham, 2003), academic success (Duff et al., 2004) and GPA (Oswald et al., 2004).

Sociability and positive emotionality are main characteristics of Extraversion (John et al., 2008) and high extraverts are generally friendly, talkative and sociable while low extraverts are generally quiet, shy and reserved (Labouvie-Vief et al., 2000). The Extraversion domain which consists of six facets of assertiveness, gregariousness, excitement-seeking, warmth, activity and positive emotions refers to a tendency to prefer company of others, stimulation and engagement with the external world (Costa and McCrae, 1992). The current study found out that Extraversion was the least anxious personality trait for the participants. Therefore, extravert students are the least anxious English speakers. This indicates that Turkish university students high in Extraversion can cope with foreign language speaking anxiety better than the students low in Extraversion

or students with other personality traits; they are the least anxious group while they speak in English. In other words, the participants who look for stimulation and excitement prefer large gatherings and groups and who are likely to be optimistic and cheerful can fight against foreign language speaking anxiety and speak English better than their peers with other personality traits. This finding of the current study is in accordance with another study where the strongest learning goal orientation is recorded for students with high Extraversion (Payne et al., 2007) and where Extraversion is correlated significantly with language learning strategies (Ayhan, 2016).

This may also indicate that students with high Extraversion level may be better capable of reducing their anxiety level, encouraging themselves and stabilizing their emotions. Besides, they are more eager to cooperate and empathize with others in their English learning process and ask questions during language classes. Again, this result is in accordance with another investigation suggesting that Extraversion explains motivation of engagement to improve oneself better (Komarraju and Karau, 2005). Likewise, Extraversion is positively related to motivation of achievement (Heaven, 1990; Kanfer et al., 1996; Busato et al., 1999; De Guzman et al., 2003).

Moreover, Extroversion is seen as having weak relationship with foreign language speaking anxiety because it is believed that extroverted learners can be more active and more engaged in tasks during classes and consequently, their choice may increase their speaking self-efficacy and decrease their FLSA. Even in language classes of extroverted teachers, students participate to lessons more and they highly interact with their peers (Bulut, 1992). For that reason, it can be asserted that Extroversion is positively correlated with English learning (Homayouni, 2011) and Extroversion and foreign language speaking anxiety are in direct relation with each other. Besides, Extraversion has a negative relation with foreign language speaking anxiety and extroverted learners are the least anxious foreign language speakers maybe because they engage activities and tasks in language classes and so, this engagement increases their English speaking self-efficacy and decreases English speaking anxiety. This result also aligns with the results of MacIntyre and Charos (1996) and Apple (2011) where foreign language speaking anxiety is directly affected by Extraversion. For the current study, among all PTs, Extraversion is the most significant predictor of FLSA and a positive contributor against anxiety. Besides, it was found out that the majority of the students were moderately extraverted in Turkey (Alishah,

2015). This is a favorable fact for the participants. This means that highly extravert students give importance to social interactions to practice their foreign language, motivate themselves to coordinate and encourage their learning with controlled emotional temperature. Moreover, asking questions to others, collaboration and empathy with others are not difficult for them.

Besides, the majority of the extravert participants in the current study feel social and they are enthusiastic in their lives. However, the talkative ones may be assertive as well. Again, the majority of the participants are not reserved, quiet and shy. This finding also agrees with Eysenck and Eysenck (1985) that extravert language learners are faster, more willing because of their ineffective memory and functional processing. But, although it is believed that Extraversion directly and negatively affects FLSA (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996), Apple (2011) suggests that Extraversion affects FLSA indirectly depending on various social situations.

In multiple linear regression analysis, Extraversion is a significant predictor for FLSA. The result of this analysis supports correlational results. Therefore, it can be suggested that Extraversion is a negative strong predictor of foreign language speaking anxiety.

Openness is the second personality trait which has a negative relation with FLSA for ELT group while it is Conscientiousness for ELL group in the current study, as Openness is the second personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs as well. This result means that participants with Openness are less anxious foreign language speakers after the participants with Extraversion for ELT group. Therefore, participants with Openness are less anxious foreign language speakers after extravert ones. Thus, the more open to new experiences a person is, the less anxious s/he is in speaking a foreign language. This result is in accordance with Kashiwagi's (2002) result that Openness is correlated with Extraversion.

Openness refers to students' innovative and studiousness characteristics and their variety of experience. Openness is thought to be related to the characteristics of fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas, values, open-minded, cultured, curious for knowledge and to learn. And mental lives of people with Openness are complex, original, deep and wide; and high open to new experiences are generally complex, curious and original while low ones are generally desolated with narrow interests and traditional, shy and reserved (Barrick and Mount, 1991). The factor Openness is closely related to affective factors like confidence, self-esteem and experience (Watson and Clark, 1992).

Openness personality trait was detected to have the highest ratio among other traits in some investigations (Arif et al., 2012). And learning English (Homayouni, 2011) and speaking in English (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996; Apple, 2011) were positively correlated with Openness. It has also significant correlations with different features of communicative competence (Verhoeven and Vermeer's, 2002). Besides, Openness has significant relations with classroom performance and GPA (Rothstein et al., 1994), strong learning goal orientation (Payne et al., 2007) and even with academic achievement (Laidra et al., 2007). When all these findings about Openness are taken into consideration, it can be seen that the result of the current study aligns with these findings. The participants with high Openness are less anxious about foreign language speaking after extraverts. It was also found out that formation ability was positively correlated with Openness (King et al., 1996) and Openness was correlated positively with Agreeableness but negatively with Neuroticism (Rubinstein, 2005) as it was in the current study. However, Openness was detected lower than Neuroticism in Korea maybe because of their religious and cultural beliefs (Yoon et al., 2002).

In the current study, Openness significantly predicts FLSA and this result means that Turkish university students are open to new ideas, new original values and have desire to discover both their inner and outer worlds. They tend to learn through interaction and lower their anxiety to motivate themselves through regulating their emotions. The majority of the participants with Openness have inspirations and interests in various things with active imaginations. Similarly, they like to come up with new opinions and take things into consideration seriously; artistic, aesthetic experiences, art, music and literature are important for them. In addition, routine is not preferred by most of the participants either. Therefore, high Openness may have important influence on foreign language speaking because it has relations with self-esteem and confidence (Watson and Clark, 1992) and with different features of communicative competence (Verhoeven and Vermeer's, 2002).

Since Openness has positive contribution to motivation of engagement and it is negatively related to negative feeling towards learning (Komarraju and Karau, 2005), it may have high significant correlation with FLSA. This finding of the current study is in accordance with another study's finding that Openness is correlated positively with English learning (Homayouni, 2011) and significantly with language learning strategies (Ayhan, 2016).

In multiple linear regression analysis, Openness is a significant predictor for FLSA. The result of this analysis supports correlational results. Therefore, it can be suggested that Openness is another negative strong predictor of foreign language speaking anxiety.

However, Conscientiousness is the second personality trait which has a negative relation with FLSA for ELL group while it is Openness for ELT group in the current study. Conscientiousness is again the second personality trait which has a negative relation with FLSA for ELL group while it is Openness for ELT group in the current study, as it is the third personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs as well. This result means that participants with Conscientiousness are less anxious foreign language speakers after the participants with Extraversion for ELL group. Thus, the more conscientious a person is, the less anxious s/he is in speaking a foreign language. From this result, it can be inferred that students with high Conscientiousness who are organized and disciplined are employing good study habits and more ready to learn and so, they have better results in English. This result also aligns with the finding of Apple (2011) that Conscientiousness has strong indirect impact on foreign language speaking.

Conscientiousness is about controlling oneself socially and as a behavior, this results in task oriented or goal oriented conduct. It is also called as 'wish to succeed' since it is related to educational success measurements. This personality trait dimension is considered as dutifulness, achievement striving, deliberation, self-discipline, competence and order (Barrick and Mount, 1991). It is also correlated positively with Agreeableness but negatively with Neuroticism (Rubinstein, 2005) as it is in the current study. Moreover, high conscientious people are generally self-disciplined, well-organized and reliable while low ones are generally negligent, undependable and disorganized.

In the current study, there is a high level of negative significant correlation of Conscientiousness with FLSA among the Turkish university students. In further analysis of multiple linear regression, it can be seen that Conscientiousness is a significant predictor of FLSA for Turkish learners as well. According to these results, Turkish university students who are generally self-disciplined, well-organized and reliable in their lives tend to be less anxious than those who are generally negligent, undependable and disorganized. This finding is in accordance with the description of Conscientiousness as socially control of oneself which promote target and duty directed attitude (John and Srivastava, 1999). And also it is in accordance with the results of some other investigations that Conscientiousness

has positive significant relations with academic achievement (O'Conner and Paunonen, 2007; Duff et al., 2004; Nofle and Robins, 2007; Barchard, 2003), with academic success (Barchard, 2003; Nofle and Robins, 2007), with GPA, with individual score (Paunonen and Ashton, 2001; Laidra et al., 2007; Duff et al., 2004) and with grades as well (Chamorro-Premuzic and Furham, 2003; Oswald et al., 2004; Kappe and van de Flier, 2010). Therefore, Turkish students with high Conscientiousness scores may be better than students with low Conscientiousness scores in academic studies. Besides, the high significant correlation with FLSA can be explained by the fact that Conscientiousness has positive contribution to motivation of achievement and it is negatively related to negative feeling towards learning (Komarraju and Karau, 2005) and that it has significant correlations with different features of communicative competence (Verhoeven and Vermeer's, 2002).

The majority of the participants with Conscientiousness are very dedicated and do their best to achieve a goal and complete a task. Besides, they give importance to their duties and tend to plan everything in advance. Moreover, the majority do their tasks precisely. These findings on goals and tasks are in accordance with the findings that students with high Conscientiousness have the strongest learning goal orientation (Payne et al., 2007). However, although they describe themselves as disorganized and lazy, these are in minority among the participants and the majority are careful in their lives. This result is also in accordance with the study where Conscientiousness is positively correlated with self-esteem (Marlar and Joubert, 2002).

Furthermore in multiple linear regression analysis, Conscientiousness is a significant predictor for FLSA. The result of this analysis supports correlational results. Therefore, it can be suggested that Conscientiousness is another negative strong predictor of foreign language speaking anxiety.

Agreeableness is the personality trait which has a positive relation with FLSA together with Neuroticism in the current study, although it is the first personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. According to the analysis, a significant relation between Agreeableness and FLSA has been detected. Agreeableness is associated with cooperation and sympathizing with others and it is another personality trait positively correlating with FLSA. It represents cooperation and compassion towards other people together with kindness, politeness, trustfulness, open to cooperation and forgive others, tender-

mindedness, compliance and tolerance (Barrick and Mount, 1991). And high agreeable people are generally cooperative, caring and friendly while low ones are generally suspicious, rude and critical since agreeableness is described as altruist, tender minded, trustful and modest traits causing cooperative direction to other people with antipathy (John and Srivastava, 1999).

In the current study, Agreeableness is significantly and positively correlated with FLSA and this result means that Turkish university students take other people into consideration and they are humanitarian, ready to help, altruistic and philanthropic. Similarly, they trust people and cooperate with others. This result is in accordance with the fact that confidence, self-esteem and experience are closely related to Agreeableness (Watson and Clark, 1992). Moreover, the majority of the participants are thoughtful towards others and ready to work with people and forget others' faults and forgive them. However, the minority of the participants describe themselves as cold and aloof, quarrel starters and rude towards others.

This result means that participants with Agreeableness are less anxious foreign language speakers than neurotic ones but more anxious foreign language speakers than the participants with other personalities. Thus, the more agreeable a person is, the less anxious s/he is in speaking a foreign language than a neurotic person but s/he is more anxious than a person with the other personalities. This result is in accordance with Kashiwagi's (2002) result that Agreeableness is slightly correlated with Conscientiousness and it is in a negative relationship with GPA (Rothstein et al., 1994) and is negatively related to classroom performance.

Agreeableness can be accepted as the most anxious personality trait after Neuroticism. This may be because Agreeableness is negatively correlated with formative capabilities (King et al., 1996) and it is correlated positively with Conscientiousness and Openness but negatively with Neuroticism (Rubinstein, 2005). Therefore, it can be suggested that students with high Agreeableness trait are the most anxious English speakers after neurotic students. The current study agrees with another study's finding that Agreeableness is positively correlated with English learning (Homayouni, 2011).

Furthermore, in multiple linear regression analysis, Agreeableness is a significant predictor for FLSA. The result of this analysis supports correlational results. Therefore, it can be suggested that Agreeableness is a positive strong predictor of foreign language speaking anxiety.

Neuroticism is the second personality trait which has a positive relation with FLSA and it is the fifth personality trait according to mean scores of all PTs. This means that neurotic participants are in minority but they are the most anxious foreign language speakers. Thus, the more neurotic a person, the more anxious s/he is in speaking a foreign language and neurotic students are the most anxious English speakers in the current study. And Neuroticism means nervousness and emotional consistency and neurotic people are generally more affective, tense, depressive, timid and uneasy with low self-confidence (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). This makes sense since Extraversion and Neuroticism are closely related to each other (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985; McCrae and Costa, 1987) and Neuroticism and Extraversion have a strong relation with affect as well (Eysenck, 1992; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985; Costa and McCrae, 1992). This result also aligns with the results of researches on scales of different personality questionnaires where two big dimensions of Neuroticism and Extraversion are supported (John and Srivastava, 1999) and with Korean personality traits studies where high levels of Neuroticism are noticed (Yoon et al., 2002) and with a study where Extraversion and Neuroticism reveal the biggest correlation between affect and personality (Yik et al., 2002). Moreover, Neuroticism is among the most crucial traits, which may have relations with some major and vital quality of an individual whose quality can be affected by hereditary factors (McCrae et al., 2000; Eysenck, 1967). Besides, foreign language speaking anxiety, Neuroticism and Extraversion are positively associated with motivation of avoidance causing negative feeling towards learning as well in a study (Komarraju and Karau, 2005).

In the current study, there is a high level of positive significant correlation of Neuroticism with FLSA among the Turkish university students. In further analysis of multiple linear regression it can be also seen that Neuroticism is another positive significant predictor of FLSA of Turkish learners as well. According to these results, most of the Turkish university students with Neuroticism feel nervous tension and bad temper and this finding can be a factor that affects their speaking English negatively. This finding on neurotic students is in accordance with the idea that Neuroticism has relation with illogical and affective behaviors and low self-respect (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975) and is negatively correlated with self-esteem (Marlar and Joubert, 2002) and with both Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Rubinstein, 2005) as it is in the current study. Besides, the majority in the current study can worry and be upset easily but do not get nervous easily. This finding is in accordance with previous findings that Neuroticism reveals the biggest correlation

between affect and personality (Yik et al., 2002). And the numbers of neurotic participants who are emotionally stable and who lose temper easily are in minority. However, although many neurotic students feel stress and cannot handle it well, they still are not depressed. Moreover, most of the neurotic students feel anxiety and cannot be calm in difficult situations. All of these findings agree with vulnerability, self-consciousness, depression, impulsiveness, angry hostility and anxiety characteristics of Neuroticism (Barrick and Mount, 1991). Moreover, these findings on Neuroticism are in accordance with the majority of previous findings that many negative items and personality problems of people are reflected in Neuroticism (Digman, 1990) and Neuroticism has positive relations with ability for empathy (Yıldırım, 2003).

Neurotic participants are in minority in current study; however, the level of their Neuroticism is significantly high. From this point of view, the current study on Neuroticism agrees with an investigation in Korea where high Neuroticism is detected. Yoon et al. (2002) suggest that Korean participants have more tendencies toward modesty and think that they could do less than their peers could; thus, the same can be suggested for Turkish participants as well.

Furthermore in multiple linear regression analysis, Neuroticism is a significant predictor for FLSA. The result of this analysis supports correlational results. Therefore, it can be suggested that Neuroticism is another positive strong significant predictor of foreign language speaking anxiety.

In sum, all of the five personality traits have relations with FLSA. The least anxious ones are respectively Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness. And the most anxious personality traits are Neuroticism and Agreeableness.

In this chapter, the results based on the data are given and discussed according to research questions. According to the results, participants of the current study have all personality traits in different portions. From the highest to lowest portions the personality traits of the participants are Agreeableness, Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Neuroticism respectively. However, a significant difference between ELT and ELL personality traits is detected. Besides, a significant difference between ELT and ELL foreign language speaking anxiety levels is detected as well; ELT group FLSA mean score is lower than ELL group FLSA mean score. Moreover, there are statistically significant relations detected between foreign language speaking anxiety, personality traits and

foreign language speaking self-efficacy of the participants. And as for foreign language speaking anxiety, all five personality traits are detected to be significant predictors of FLSA for the participants. There are positive relations between FLSA and Neuroticism and Agreeableness. However, there are negative relations between FLSA and Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness. Therefore, all personality traits have significant relations with anxiety in English speaking. Neuroticism and Agreeableness are the most anxious PTs and the least anxious PTs are Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness. Besides, all personality traits have significant relations with self-efficacy in English speaking as well and FLSSE is the most significant predictor of FLSA.



CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, first the research findings are discussed and evaluated. And then, the pedagogical implications according to the findings and the limitations of the study are presented. Then after the suggestions for further investigations are given, this chapter finishes with overall conclusions.

Overall results showed that both ELT and ELL groups have all types of personality and it is possible to distinguish all personality traits, but no personality trait prevails the others in each group, and all personality traits are in equal proportion in each group and between groups. Both ELT and ELL groups have the same sequence of the personality traits but the ratios are lower in ELL group; all variables are higher in ELT group except Neuroticism than they are in ELL group. For both groups Agreeableness is the highest construct of personality traits, whereas the other personality traits are Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion and Neuroticism respectively. According to the results, comparing two groups, ELT group can be suggested as more agreeable, open to new experiences, conscientious, extravert, however, less neurotic than ELL group is. This can be accepted as a positive indicator since less Neuroticism is directly related to higher FLSSE and lower FLSA. In addition, Neuroticism is closely related to negative sides of human personality and therefore, Neuroticism may result in poor EFL success.

The results of the current study are in harmony with many researches in the field. People do not generally choose their professions according to their personalities; in the current research study, all personalities are detected for both ELT and ELL students since they

have chosen to study English according to their interests, capabilities or other reasons and not because of their personalities.

The analysis showed that the mean scores of foreign language speaking anxiety of ELT and ELL students are significantly different. ELT students seem to have less foreign language speaking anxiety than ELL students. The FLSA mean score of ELT group is lower than FLSA mean score of ELL group; this finding indicates that ELL students feel higher anxiety than ELT students do. In other words, ELT group's FLSA level is lower than ELL group's; ELT students are less anxious about speaking English than ELL students. Self and self-identity types may explain this difference in speaking anxiety between two groups. Besides, the reasons of low foreign language speaking anxiety of ELT students can be explained by ideal teacher self, ought-to language teacher self and avoidance of feared language teacher self, all of which motivate ELT students to speak English in classroom since an English teacher is expected to speak a good English during teaching. However, ELL students do not have such obligations as teaching English in classroom.

The correlation coefficients of the participants showed that the relations among all variables were significant for all participants. FLSA has the highest negative and significant relation with FLSSE. And as for PTs, Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness from the highest respectively have negative and significant relations with FLSA. According to these findings, the students with high FLSSE have the least anxiety in speaking English. Moreover, as for personality traits, the results show that the least anxious English speakers are extravert students. Then students who are open to new experiences are the least anxious foreign language speakers after extravert participants. Conscientious students are in the third place for FLSA. Among the personality traits, Agreeableness personality trait, which is correlating negatively with FLSA, is the last one. Therefore, it can be suggested that agreeable students have more English speaking anxiety than the students with Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness which are other three negatively correlated PTs. This result means that agreeable students have high level of FLSA and they are only less anxious English speakers than the neurotic students. Moreover, Neuroticism is the only personality trait which has a positively significant relation with FLSA. This finding indicates that neurotic students have the highest level of foreign language anxiety. In short, it can be deduced that

more Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness mean less anxiety in English speaking. Similarly, more Neuroticism means more anxiety in speaking English.

In the fields of foreign and second language learning, many investigations have been dedicated to self-efficacy; however, no investigation on the relation between personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy has been found. The current study is the first from this point of view. The correlation coefficients of the participants also indicated that FLSSE had positively significant relations with Extraversion, Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness from the highest respectively. According to these findings, high results in Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness mean high self-efficacy in English speaking. Among the personality traits, Agreeableness is the last one which has a positive correlation with FLSSE. This finding may indicate that agreeable students have the least self-efficacy in speaking English among the students with other three positively correlated PTs (Openness, Extraversion and Conscientiousness). Therefore, students with high Agreeableness are only more self-efficient English speakers than the neurotic students. Moreover, Neuroticism is the only personality trait which has a negatively significant relation with FLSSE. This may be regarded as normal since Neuroticism has a positive relation only with FLSA. According to this finding, it can be suggested that students with high Neuroticism feel the least self-efficacy in English speaking. The seventh variable, FLSA has also a negative and significant relation with FLSSE. This may mean that individuals with high FLSSE feel themselves less anxious in speaking English.

The results indicate that the Big Five personality traits exist for the participants in this study. For the whole participants, all of five personality traits significantly predicted Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety and Neuroticism was the most anxious and Extraversion was the least anxious personality traits.

For FLSA, the results showed that FLSSE was the most powerful predictor of FLSA and it had a negative relation with it as well for all participants. And as for ELT group, Extraversion and Openness predicted the FLSA in a negative way but Neuroticism and Agreeableness predicted the FLSA in a positive way. This finding shows that extravert students and students open to new experiences in ELT group have the least anxiety in speaking English; however, neurotic and agreeable ELT students have the highest anxiety in English speaking. This also means for ELT group that Extraversion is the least anxious

trait while Neuroticism is the most anxious one. On the other hand, FLSA has not been predicted significantly by Conscientiousness personality trait. Regarding the above-mentioned variables, there are significant relations among anxiety in speaking a foreign language, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. In short, the results proved the existence of FLSSE together with four personality traits (Extraversion, Openness, Neuroticism and Agreeableness) for the participants concerning the FLSA.

Two of the four personality traits which are related to FLSA for ELT to some extent are Extraversion and Openness; and these two personality traits have negative relations with FLSA. And the other two traits are Agreeableness and Neuroticism; and these two personality traits have positive relations with FLSA. This means that participants open to new experiences and the extravert ones feel less anxiety in speaking English. However, neurotic and agreeable participants are the most anxious speakers. This means that except Neuroticism and Agreeableness, the other two personality traits affect FLSA negatively.

And as for ELL group, FLSSE was the most powerful predictor of FLSA. Among the personality traits, Extraversion and Conscientiousness predicted the FLSA negatively but Neuroticism and Agreeableness predicted the FLSA positively. According to these findings, it can be suggested that extraverted and conscientious students have the least anxiety in speaking English while neurotic and agreeable students have the highest anxiety in English speaking in ELL group. This also means that Extraversion is the least anxious trait and Neuroticism is the most anxious one for ELL group. On the other hand, Openness personality trait did not predict FLSA significantly. Therefore, the relationships between anxiety in speaking a foreign language, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy are significant according to the variables above.

Regarding the above-mentioned variables, there are significant relations among anxiety in speaking a foreign language, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. In short, the results proved the existence of FLSSE together with four personality traits (Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Agreeableness) for the participants concerning the FLSA.

The results also indicate that in ELL group four personality traits are related to FLSA. Out of these four traits, Extraversion and Conscientiousness have negative relations with FLSA while the other two, Agreeableness and Neuroticism have positive relation with it. So, it can be suggested that extravert and conscientious participants have low anxiety levels but

neurotic and agreeable participants have high anxiety in speaking English. This also means that except Neuroticism and Agreeableness, the other two personality traits, Extraversion and Conscientiousness affect FLSA negatively. And among the personality traits, Agreeableness takes attention since it has a positive relation with FLSA together with Neuroticism; and according to this finding, agreeable people seem to be anxious about speaking English together with neurotic ones. Besides, according to the mean scores of the PTs, most of the participants have Agreeableness personality trait and Agreeableness has a positive relation with speaking English. This result can be generalized and so, the majority of Turkish people have Agreeableness and Agreeableness has a positive significant relation with FLSA. Therefore, this finding may explain why Turkish people cannot speak English.

In sum, all personality traits and FLSSE significantly predict FLSA. FLSSE, Extraversion, Openness and Conscientiousness have negatively significant relations with FLSA while Agreeableness and Neuroticism have positively significant relations with FLSA. Besides, there is an inverse relation between FLSA and FLSSE. Therefore, low FLSA means high FLSSE and high FLSA means low FLSSE.

5.1 Pedagogical Implications

Personality traits of learners, their FLSA and FLSSE levels in the current study imply that higher or lower speaking anxiety and self-efficacy are not only elements for learners to speak freely in English but there are personality factors affecting the levels of anxiety in speaking as well. In addition, the results demonstrate that although there are all kinds of personality traits in a group of learners of a major, since people do not choose their departments according to their personalities generally, the given education, curriculum of the program and the priorities of the department may affect FLSA positively or negatively. Thus, the results also show that there are strong personality elements which cannot be altered for FLSA and FLSSE but there are other elements such as education, curriculum and priorities of the department which may not change students' personalities but can help them cope with their speaking anxiety in foreign language and teach them to increase their speaking self-efficacy and counterbalance students' internal tendencies toward foreign language speaking anxiety and lack of self-efficacy as well. The findings have also implications which may supply pedagogical and practical advantages for foreign language classes, teaching and learning.

Therefore, the current study has some implications for English language teaching program administrators, developers, English language teachers and students. The level of the students at the beginning of some programs, for example in prep schools is determined with placement tests and students are grouped according to their success. For this reason, groups are heterogeneous with different personality traits. However, there are students with personalities more open such as extraverts and less open such as introverts and neurotics to communicate in the same groups. With extravert students, some students may feel more anxious, timid, inferior and less self-efficient to speak, even their English is not poor. Students with same personality traits may feel themselves more comfortable, open to communicate and less inferior. Therefore, it can be better to separate students according to their personalities besides their foreign language levels during English teaching process. Thus, better suitable learning environment and experiences can be achieved to teach English in classroom, students may like the subject more and this may provide more self-efficacious feelings in them. Regarding their personality characteristics, their capacities and progress in learning English can be emphasized through challenging but attainable tasks and frequent encouragement in English lessons by teachers. In addition to these suggestions, teachers of English language should be acquainted with their students' perceived strengths and weaknesses in general English learning together with specific learning tasks in their language classrooms.

According to the results of the current study, it is important to separate students in accordance with their personalities, at least in classroom activities, but this alone is not enough. In addition, programs and methods should be developed for each personality trait in order to lower foreign language speaking anxiety of students and increase their speaking self-efficacy. Students with similar personalities, especially not very talkative introverts and neurotics may feel more comfortable and relaxed in the same classroom that encourages low affective filter. Such an environment may decrease their speaking anxiety, increase speaking self-efficacy and so, contribute their foreign language speaking ability positively. It should not be forgotten that a lot of social learning happens among peers and social comparison can be highly beneficial if there are good models for students.

The results of this study have some implications for English language lecturers at universities which can be useful for English teachers at schools as well. In foreign language classrooms, educators should be careful about the factors that affect the level of

speaking anxiety and self-efficacy of their students; when they decide on why and where their students are silent and do not talk in English during their English teaching process, they should also take the personalities of their students into consideration besides other factors such as low level of English. Students may have enough knowledge and ability to answer questions or to participate activities but their personalities may hinder them from answering or participating. As suggested before, it can be better if students are divided according to their personalities besides their language level at the beginning of their study and given language education with proper programs and methods according to their personalities. However, if this cannot be done, language teachers can determine the personality traits of their students and pair or group them accordingly to help their students to overcome the fear of speaking in English, lower their speaking anxiety and increase their speaking self-efficacy. Employing pair and group activities among the students with similar personalities may increase cooperation, communication and peer support. Thus, students with a tendency toward anxious behavior in speaking and overall language may have lower affective filter and speak more freely with people having similar personalities in their class. Such a classroom environment can establish a friendly, constructive and noncompetitive atmosphere which raises English speaking self-efficacy, lowers speaking anxiety, increases the desire to speak English and develops any sense of efficacy and confidence in speaking English, even among the students who have non-talkative personality traits.

The results of this study have some implications for English language learners as well. Learners should be aware of their personalities and the characteristics. Some people may speak freely in their own languages or in other languages but some may find it difficult to speak even in their mother tongue, especially in front of a group. Some people may know a foreign language well but not communicate with foreigners. When people cannot speak in English, others think they do not know English at all or know very little, but the reality may be different from the outward show. People with certain personality traits such as introverts and neurotics may feel inferior when they are together with, for example, extraverts who are very talkative, feeling less anxious and more self-efficient during speaking. Some people may know English but still they cannot speak it; this does not mean they do not know English. Together with the extraverts, introverts feel more anxious and less self-efficient as they may be afraid of making mistakes, feeling embarrassed. This may be valid for English classes as well. During their English lessons, generally some students

are more active but some need to be pushed to participate activities but this should not always mean that less active students know English less than active ones. In groups with similar personalities, these students may feel speaking English more. Therefore, EFL learners should not be discouraged when they feel anxious and less self-efficient about speaking English, since their personalities may cause these negative feelings during their English learning process. Silent, non-talkative students may feel better and positive towards speaking English and do not feel bad or inferior beside talkative students if they know their personality traits and the reason for their silence is not caused by their English level but because of their personalities.

5.2 Limitations of the Study

The participants were students from thirty-one different universities in Turkey, so the results can be generalizable for them. However, further generalization can be possible for other groups and for different universities and majors whose medium of instruction is English.

Prior to the current study, participants were not checked for their English proficiency levels. In order to determine the levels of speaking self-efficacy proficiency perceptions are more important than actual English proficiency. Therefore, connections between English proficiency and foreign language speaking anxiety or self-efficacy were not investigated because there were no English proficiency scores of students.

The data in the current study were collected through questionnaires. But as Paulhus (1991) indicates the data could be affected by social desirability; that is to say, the participants might have given responses not as they really felt or believed but as they thought they should have responded or were expected to respond to the questions. Data collection method depends on participants' perceptions and accordingly, their self-reported information; so, the study may give information about the participants at only a specific point in time which can be described as a snapshot or cross-sectional perspective in their lives. Data were collected from different and separate universities spread across the country and besides, questionnaires have another limitation because they reveal students' perception of the issue rather than observable facts. Therefore, questionnaires could be supported by some qualitative methods such as classroom observation, diaries, open-ended questions, interviews or observations as well.

Also the current study investigates only the relations among the variables without displaying cause and effect relations, since it is not possible to make causal statements without an experimental study. And only relationships between foreign language speaking anxiety and both personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy were included in the current study.

Also this study focuses on the correlation between personality traits, FLSA and FLSSE among ELT and ELL students at Turkish universities. Focusing on how to reduce anxiety in speaking a foreign language and to increase self-efficacy in speaking a foreign language may need further studies.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

The participants of the current study were English major (ELT-ELL) university students of Turkish universities. For this reason, it is not possible to know if results of personality traits in the current study have similarities or differences with other eastern or western countries. And if there are, what kind of similarities or differences Turkey and other eastern or western countries have are not known either. Therefore, further research can be dedicated to implement personality traits questionnaire in different cultures, eastern or western and compare the results with those in the current study.

Further research can also be conducted among other English and non-English major university students or even among high schools and private secondary schools in which the medium of instruction is English. As for self-efficacy variable, only foreign language speaking self-efficacy was included in this study; self-efficacy of reading, writing and listening can also be added in future.

The current study has shown significant relations between personality traits and both foreign language speaking anxiety and foreign language speaking self-efficacy. However, since the data were collected through questionnaires, the study could be suggested as relying on stated behaviors more than actual ones. Further investigations may include not only stated behaviors but actual behaviors as well and data can be collected not only through questionnaires but also through observations such as how many times and how much students actually speak in their English lessons and interviews where students can assess their classmates or teachers can assess their students.

Further research can also be conducted to find out whether personality traits continue to be same over time. The same sample can be examined longitudinally to test whether their personality traits and foreign language speaking anxiety and self-efficacy remain stable, as they begin to work professionally in different jobs. But because it may be difficult to find graduates and test them, a further study can be conducted for freshmen in their first year and repeated when they are seniors to see the differences.

Some different variables such as motivation and learner beliefs can be added to the model and their interaction with foreign language speaking anxiety, personality traits and foreign language speaking self-efficacy can be investigated as well.

Finally, determining the personality traits of the students and giving education correspondingly may increase their foreign language speaking self-efficacy and decrease anxiety. Therefore, future studies can deal with the effectiveness of this personality-based English language education through self and peer observations, feedback from students and teachers, especially in prep schools.

REFERENCES

- Abalı, F. (2006). *The effect of personality traits extroversion/introversion on verbal and interactive behaviors of learners*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>.
- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 55-168.
- Akbağ, M., & Gökten, B. (2010). An investigation on Turkish military school students: Are there associations among big five personality factors, perceived family environment and hopelessness? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2010), 5458–5462.
- Akiskal, H. S., & Hirschfeld, R. M. A. (1983). The relationship of personality to affective disorders: A critical review. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 40, 801- 810.
- Aktaş, A. (2006). *Farklı Kültürlerdeki Yöneticilerin Kişilik Özelliklerine Dayanarak Liderlik Anlayışlarının Belirlenmesi: Türk ve Amerikan Otel Yöneticilerinin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi*. Master's Thesis, Akdeniz University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Antalya.
- Alderman, M. K. (1999). *Motivation for achievement: Possibilities for teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Alishah, R. A. (2014). Is willingness-to-speak more of a context-sensitive nature or personality? *ELT Research Journal*, 3(4), 169-180.
- Alishah, R. A. (2015). *A study of factors affecting Turkish EFL learners' willingness to speak in English*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>

- Alkış, N. (2015). *The influence of personality traits, motivation and persuasion principles on academic performance*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York, USA: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York, USA: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Almagor, M., Tellegen, A., & Waller, N. G. (1995). The big seven model: A cross cultural replication and further exploration of the basic dimensions of natural language trait descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 300-307.
- Alpert, R., & Haber R. N. (1960). Anxiety in academic achievement situations. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 61(2), 207- 215.
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT journal*, 56(1), 57-64.
- Anderson, G. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research*. London: The Felmer Press.
- Ando, J., Suzuki, A., Yamagata, S., Kijima, N., Maekawa, H., Ono, Y., ... Jang, K. L. (2004). Genetic and environmental structure of Cloninger's temperament and character dimensions. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 18(4), 379-393.
- Apple, M. T. (2011). *The Big Five personality traits and foreign language speaking confidence among Japanese EFL students*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digital.library.temple.edu/cdm/ref/collection/p245801coll10/id/127286/>
- Arif, M. I., Rashid, A., Tahira, S. S., & Akhter, M. (2012). Personality and teaching: An investigation into prospective teachers' personality. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(17), 161- 171.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to Research in Education*. USA, Belmont: Thomson Learning.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2001). A theoretical basis for the major dimensions of personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 15(5), 327-353.
- Ashton, M. C., Perugini, M., de Vries, R. E., Boies, K., Lee, K., Szarota, P., Blas, L. D., ... Raad, B. D. (2004). A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives:

- Solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 86(2), 353-366.
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., de Vries, R. E., Perugini, M., Gnisci, A., & Sergi, I. (2006). The HEXACO model of personality structure and indigenous lexical personality dimensions in Italian, Dutch, and English. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(6), 851-875.
- Asmali, M. (2014). The relationship between the Big Five personality traits and language learning strategies. *Balikesir University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 17(32), 1-18.
- Atak, H. (2009). Big Five traits and loneliness among Turkish emerging adults. *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences*, 4(10), 749-753.
- Atbaş, E. E. (1997). *An investigation of the relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and the oral proficiency of learners of English in an EFL setting in Turkey*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Ay, S. (2010). Young adolescent students' foreign language anxiety in relation to language skills at different levels. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 3(11), 83-92.
- Aydın, B. (1999). *A study of sources of foreign language classroom anxiety in speaking and writing classes*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Aydın, S. (2008). An investigation on the language anxiety and fear of negative evaluation among Turkish EFL Learners. *Asian EFL Journal, Teaching Articles*, 30(1), 421-444.
- Aydoğan, H. (2016). A psycholinguistics case study in turkey: basic psychological needs and personality traits as predictors of students' average final grades. *International Journal of Social Science* 48(2), 283-291.
- Ayhan, Ü. (2016). *The use of language learning strategies and its relationship with personality traits and individual differences: The case of Bosnian students at a private university*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Babbie, E. R. (2015). *The practice of social research*. Nelson Education.
- Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: Looking at and through the diary studies. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.),

- Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 67-102). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Balemir, S. H. (2009). *The sources of foreign language speaking anxiety and the relationship between proficiency level and the degree of foreign language speaking anxiety*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191.
- Bandura, A. (1984). Recycling misconceptions of perceived self-efficacy. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 8(3), 231-255.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development. Vol. 6. Six theories of child development* (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Retrieved from <http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Bandura/Bandura1989ACD.pdf>.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248-287.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 1-26.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Development*, 1206-1222.
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(3), 586-598.
- Barchard, K. A. (2003). Does emotional intelligence assist in the prediction of academic success?. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63(5), 840-858.

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M., K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1996). Effects of impression management and self-deception on the predictive validity of personality constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 261-272.
- Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 43-51.
- Bartlett, B. J., & Elliott, S. N., (2008). The contributions of educational psychology to school psychology. In T. B. Gutkin, & C. R. Reynolds, (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (6th Ed.) (pp. 65-83). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Batumlu, Z. D., & Erden, M. (2007). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu hazırlık öğrencilerinin yabancı dil kaygıları ile İngilizce başarıları arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 3(1), 24-38.
- Baumgartner, H. (1990). *Measurement evaluation PE 4e Im*. McGraw-Hill Inc., US.
- Bayram, N. (2015). *Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS ile veri analizi*. Ezgi Kitabevi, Bursa, Turkey.
- Bekleyen, N. (2004). The influence of teachers and peers on foreign language classroom anxiety. *Dil Dergisi*, 123, 49-66. Retrieved from <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/27/745/9525.pdf>.
- Ben-Porath, Y. S. (1990). Cross-cultural assessment of personality: The case for replicatory factor analysis. *Advances in Personality Assessment*, 8, 27-48.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(3), 729-750.
- Berndt, T. J. (2002). Friendship quality and social development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11(1), 7-10.
- Bidjerano, T., & Dai, D. Y. (2007). The relationship between the Big-Five model of personality and self-regulated learning strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 17(1), 69-81.

- Bird, D. K. (2009). The use of questionnaires for acquiring information on public perception of natural hazards and risk mitigation—a review of current knowledge and practice. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 9(4), 1307-1325.
- Boeree, C. G. (2006). *Personality theories*. Psychology Department, Shippensburg.
- Bond, M. H., Nakazato, H., & Shiraishi, D. (1975). Universality and distinctiveness in dimensions of Japanese person perception. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 6(3), 346-357.
- Bouffard-Bouchard, T. (1990). Influence of self-efficacy on performance in a cognitive task. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 130(3), 353-363.
- Bozath, İ. (2003). *Academic oral presentation skills instructors' perceptions of the final project presentation rating scale used in the modern languages department at Middle East Technical University*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 371-399.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, J. D. (2003, May). Promoting fluency in EFL classrooms. In *Proceedings of the 2nd annual JALT Pan-SIG conference* (pp. 1-12). Kyoto, Japan: Kyoto institute of Technology.
- Brown, J. D., Robson, G., & Rosenkjar, P. R. (2001). Personality, motivation, anxiety, strategies, and language proficiency of Japanese students. In Z. Dörnyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 361-391). Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.
- Bruck, C. S., & Allen, T. D. (2003). The relationship between Big Five personality traits, negative affectivity, type A behavior, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 457-472.
- Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., & Ronning, R. R. (1999). *Cognitive psychology and instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Bulut, D. (1992). *The relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extraversion in teachers and student talk in speaking classes, and effects of teachers gender on this relationship*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Burger, J. M. (2006). *Personality--theory and research*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Burgess, T. F. (2001). Guide to the design of questionnaires. *A general introduction to the design of questionnaires for survey research*. Retrieved from <http://http://iss.leeds.ac.uk/downloads/top2.pdf>.
- Burkett, M.C. (2011). *Relationships Among Teachers' Personality, Leadership Style, and Efficacy of Classroom Management*. Doctoral Dissertation, Walden University.
- Burns, A. C., & Bush, R. F. (2003). *Research design*. Pearson/Prentice-Hall.
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on Speaking*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia 2109.
- Busato, V. V., Prins, F. J., Elshout, J. J., & Hamaker, C. (1998). The relation between learning styles, the Big Five personality traits and achievement motivation in higher education. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 26(1), 129-140.
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extraversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*, 32(1), 109-132.
- Buss, A. H. (1989). Personality as traits. *American Psychologist*, 44(11), 1378-1388.
- Buss, D. M., & Craik, K. H. (1983). The act frequency approach to personality. *Psychological Review*, 90(2), 105-126.
- Bygate M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Campbell, C. M., & Ortiz, J. (1991). Helping students overcome foreign language anxiety: A foreign language anxiety workshop. *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*, 153-168.
- Capan, S. A., & Simsek, H. (2012). General foreign language anxiety among EFL learners: A survey study. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 3(11) 116-124.
- Carr, H. A., & Kingsbury, F. A. (1938). The concept of traits. *Psychological Review*, 45(6), 497-524.

- Carrell, P. L., Prince, M. S., & Astika, G. G. (1996). Personality types and language learning in an EFL context. *Language Learning*, 46(1), 75-99.
- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2002). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carver, C. S., Reynolds, S. L., & Scheier, M. F. (1994). The possible selves of optimists and pessimists. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28(2), 133-141.
- Caspi, A. (2000). The child is father of the man: Personality continuities from childhood to adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(1), 158-172.
- Cattell, R. B. (1943). The description of personality: Basic traits resolved into clusters. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 476-506.
- Cattell, R. B. (1965). *The scientific study of personality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Cattell, R. B. (1973). *Personality and mood by questionnaire*. New York: Jossey Bass.
- Cattell, R. B. & Kline, P. (1977). *The scientific analysis of personality and motivation*. New York: Academic.
- Cattell, R. B. (1978). *The scientific use of factor analysis*. New York: Plenum.
- Cervone, D. & Pervin, L. A. (2008). *Personality theory and research*. New Jersey, USA: Wiley.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal university samples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(4), 319-338.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2005). *Personality and intellectual competence*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14-26.
- Chamot, A. U., Barnhart, S., El-Dinary, P., & Robbins, J. (1996). High school foreign language students' perceptions of language learning strategy use and self-efficacy. *Unpublished report*. National Foreign Language Resource Centre, Georgetown University.

- Chaney, A. L., & Burk, T. L. (1998). *Teaching Oral Communication in Grades K-8*. Allyn and Bacon, Order Processing, PO Box 11071, Des Moines, IA 50336-1071.
- Chapell, M. S., Blanding, Z. B., & Silverstein, M. E. (2005). Test anxiety and academic achievement in undergraduate and graduate students. *Journal of Education Psychology, 97*(2), 268-278.
- Chastain, K. (1975). Affective and ability factors in second-language acquisition. *Language Learning, 25*(1), 153-161.
- Cheng, Y. S. (2001). Learners' beliefs and second language anxiety. *Concentric: Studies in English Literature and Linguistics, 27*(2), 75-90.
- Cheng, J. C. (2005). *The relationship to foreign language anxiety of oral performance achievement, teacher characteristics and in-class activities*. Master's Thesis, Ming Chuan University, Taiwan.
- Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning, 49*(3), 417-446.
- Cheung, F. M., Leung, K., Zhang, J.-X., Sun, H.-F., Gan, Y.-Q., Song, W.-Z., ... Xie, D. (2001). Indigenous Chinese personality constructs: Is the five-factor model complete? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*(4), 407-433. <http://doi:10.1177/0022022101032004003>
- Cheung, F. M., Cheung, S. F., Wada, S., & Zhang, J.-X. (2003). Indigenous measures of personality assessment in Asian countries: A review. *Psychological Assessment, 15*(3), 280-289.
- Chomsky, N. (2014). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Vol. 11). MIT press.
- Clark, M. H., & Schroth, C. A. (2010). Examining relationships between academic motivation and personality among college students. *Learning and Individual Differences, 20*(1), 19-24.
- Clément, R., Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of context, norms, and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 22*(2), 190-209.
- Clément, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: A study of Francophones learning English. *Canadian Journal*

- of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, 9(2), 123-133.
- Cloninger, C. R. (1987). A systematic method for clinical description and classification of personality variants: A proposal. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 44(6), 573-588.
- Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic, D. M., & Przybeck, T. R. (1993). A psychobiological model of temperament and character. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50(12), 975-990.
- Cloninger, S. C. (2000). *Theories of personality: Understanding persons* (3rd Ed.). USA: Prentice Hall.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Cook, V. (2013). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Routledge.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality inventory manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(6), 653-665.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992a). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: what do learners believe about them? *System*, 27(4), 493-513.
- Covington, M. V. (1985). Test anxiety: Causes and effects over time. *Advances in Test Anxiety Research*, 4, 55-68.
- Cramer, D. (1998). *Fundamental statistics for social research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1990). *Essentials of psychological testing*. (5th Ed.) New York: Harper.
- Crookall, D., & Oxford, R. (1991). Dealing with anxiety: Some practical activities for language learners and teacher trainees. *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*, 141-150.
- Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. R. (1999). The cultural constitution of personality. *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, 2, 378-396.

- Çakar, G. G. (2009). *The relationship between past language learning experiences and foreign language anxiety of Turkish university EFL students*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Çetinkaya, Y. B. (2005). *Turkish college students' willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language*. Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Ohio.
- Çubukçu, F. (2008). A Study on the Correlation between Self Efficacy and Foreign Language Learning Anxiety. *Online Submission*, 4(1), 148-158.
- Daele, S., Housen, A., Pierrard, M., & Debruyn, L. (2006). The effect of extraversion on oral L2 proficiency. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 6(1), 213-236.
- Dalkılıç, N. (2001). *An investigation into the role of anxiety on students' success in second language learning*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Dallal, G. E. (2007). *The little handbook of statistical practice*. Retrieved from <https://www.jerrydallal.com/LHSP/mc.htm>
- Daly, J. (1991). Understanding communication apprehension: An introduction for language educators. *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*, 3-13.
- Dede, Bahar (2009). *Kişilik Özelliklerinin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerinde Etkileri: Bankalar Örneği*. Yayınlanmamış Master's Thesis, Karadeniz Teknik University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Trabzon.
- De Feyter, T., Caers, R., Vigna, C., & Berings, D. (2012). Unraveling the impact of the Big Five personality traits on academic performance: The moderating and mediating effects of self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(4), 439-448.
- De Fruyt, F., Mervielde, I., Hoekstra, H. A., & Rolland, J. P. (2000). Assessing adolescents' personality with the NEO PI-R. *Assessment*, 7(4), 329-345.
- De Fruyt, F., McCrae, R. R., Szirmák, Z., & Nagy, J. (2004). The five-factor personality inventory as a measure of the five-factor model Belgian, American, and Hungarian comparisons with the NEO-PI-R. *Assessment*, 11(3), 207-215.
- De Guzman, I. N., Calderon, A., & Cassaretto, M. (2003). Personality and academic achievement in university students. *Revista de Psicologia*, 21(1), 119-143.

- De Raad, B. (2000). *The Big Five personality factors: The psycholexical approach to personality*. Seattle, WA: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- De Raad, B. E., & Perugini, M. E. (2002). *Big Five assessment*. Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Dellinger, A. B., Bobbett, J. J., Olivier, D. F., & Ellett, C. D. (2008). Measuring teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Development and use of the TEBS-Self. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(3), 751-766.
- Demirezen, M. (2015j, September). *The establishment of self in pronunciation and intonation in teacher training: A demonstration by computer via the PRAATS program*. Paper presented in The Self in Language Learning International Conference, Adana.
- Demirezen, M. (2015k, September). *The perception of pitch phonemes by prospective students: A difficulty in developing intonation in ideal self*. Paper presented in The Self in Language Learning International Conference, Adana.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2007). Predicting language learners' grades in the L1, L2, L3 and L4: The effect of some psychological and sociocognitive variables. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 4*(3), 169-197.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Furnham, A. (1999). Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning, 49*(3), 509-544.
- Di Blas, L., & Forzi, M. (1999). Refining a descriptive structure of personality attributes in the Italian language: The abridged big three circumplex structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*(3), 451-481.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*(1), 417.
- Digman, J. M. (1996). The curious history of the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives*, (pp. 1-20). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Diseth, Å. (2003). Personality and approaches to learning as predictors of academic achievement. *European Journal of personality, 17*(2), 143-155.

- Dixon, B. M. W. (1977). Where have all the adjectives gone?. *Studies in Language*, 1(1), 19-80.
- Djigunović, J. M. (2006). Language anxiety and language processing. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 6(1), 191-212.
- Draper, N. R., Smith, H., & Pownell, E. (1966). *Applied regression analysis* (Vol. 3). New York: Wiley.
- Duff, A., Boyle, E., Dunleavy, K., & Ferguson, J. (2004). The relationship between personality, approach to learning and academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(8), 1907-1920.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256.
- Ehrlich, P. R. (2000). *Human natures: Genes, cultures, and the human prospect*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Ehrman, M. (1990). Owls and doves: Cognition, personality, and learning success. *Linguistics, Language Teaching, and Language Acquisition: The Interdependence of Theory, Practice, and Research*, 413-437.
- Ehrman, M. E. (1996). *Understanding second language learning difficulties*. California: Sage Publications.
- Ehrman, M. (2008). *Personality and good language learners*. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners*, (pp. 61-72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(3), 311-327.
- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(1), 67-89.
- Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System*, 31(3), 313-330.
- Ekizoglu, N., & Ozcinar, Z. (2010). The relationship between the teacher candidates' computer and internet based anxiety and perceived self-efficacy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 5881-5890.

- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Epstein, S., & Morling, B. (1995). Is the self motivated to do more than enhance and/or verify itself?. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 9-29). Springer US.
- Erdemir, F. (2000). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Yalnızlık Düzeyi ve Bazı Sosyo-Demokratifk Etmenlerin Yaşam Doyumuyla İlişkisi*. Paper presented in 6. National Psychology Congress at Koç University, Istanbul.
- Erkan, Y. D., & Saban, A. I. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in, writing and attitudes towards writing: A Correlational Study in Turkish Tertiary-Level EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 13(1), 163-191.
- Erkuş, A. & Tabak, A. (2009). Beş Faktör Kişilik Özelliklerinin Çalışanların Çatışma Yönetim Tarzlarına Etkisi: Savunma Sanayinde Bir Araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 23(2), 213-242.
- Erton, I. (2004). *Relations between personality, language learning and teaching: The contribution of personality traits (introversion, extroversion, ambiversion) to the development of language learning styles and strategies and their effects on student success in foreign language achievement at university level*. Doctoral Dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Erton, I. (2010). Relations between personality traits, language learning styles and success in foreign language achievement. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education)*, 38(38), 115-126.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1970). *The structure of human personality* (3rd Ed.). London: Methuen.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1981). General features of the model. In H. J. Eysenck (Ed.), *A model for personality* (pp. 1-37). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1991). Dimensions of personality: 16, 5 or 3?—Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12(8), 773-790.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1992). Four ways five factors are not basic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(6), 667-673.

- Eysenck, H. J. (2000). The new look in personality and intelligence research: The advent of the paradigm. In J. Mohan (Ed.), *Personality across cultures: Recent developments and debates* (pp. 1-14). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Eysenck, S., & Barrett, P. (2013). Re-introduction to cross-cultural studies of the EPQ. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(4), 485-489.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1969). *Personality structure and measurement*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J. & Eysenck S. B. G. (1984). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory*. Sevenoaks: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Eysenck, H. J., and Eysenck, S. B. G., (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales*. Hodder & Stoughton, London.
- Fazeli, S. (2012). Personality traits as predictors of the social English learning strategies. *International Journal of Behavioural Social and Movement Sciences*, 1(3), 9-22.
- Feng, Z. (2007). *The perceptions of Chinese junior high and senior high students regarding the teaching and learning of English listening and speaking skills*. Doctoral Dissertation, Texas Tech University, USA.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*: Sage publications.
- Fiske, A. P., Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Nisbett, R. E. (1998). The cultural matrix of social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th Ed.) (pp. 915-981). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Foss, K. A., & Reitzel, A. C. (1988). A relational model for managing second language anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(3), 437-454.
- Fox, N. A., Henderson, H. A., Marshall, P. J., Nichols K. E., & Ghera, M. A. (2005). Behavioral inhibition: Linking biology and behavior within a developmental framework. *Annual review of Psychology*, 56, 235-262.

- Friedman, K. (2003). Theory construction in design research: Criteria, approaches, and methods. *Design Studies*, 24(6), 507-522.
- Friedman, H., S. & Schustack, M. W. (1999). *Personality: Classic theories and modern research*. USA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Friday, A. S. (2005). *Criterion-related validity of Big Five adolescent personality traits*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Furnham, A., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2004). Personality and intelligence as predictors of statistics examination grades. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37(5), 943-955.
- Furnham, A., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & McDougall, F. (2002). Personality, cognitive ability, and beliefs about intelligence as predictors of academic performance. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 14(1), 47-64.
- Gahungu, O. N. (2007). *The relationships among strategy use, self-efficacy, and language ability in foreign language learners*. Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Arizona University, USA.
- Galton, F. (1884). Measurement of character. *Fortnightly Review*, 36, 179-185.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., Clément, R., & Gliksman, L. (1976). Second language acquisition: A social psychological perspective. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32, 198-213.
- Gatbonton, E., & Segalowitz, N. (1988). Creative automatization: Principles for promoting fluency within a communicative framework. *TESOL quarterly*, 22(3), 473-492.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2011). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Pearson Higher Ed.

- Gillespie, N. A., Cloninger, C. R., Heath, A. C., & Martin, N. G. (2003). The genetic and environmental relationship between Cloninger's dimensions of temperament and character. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*(8), 1931-1946.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*(1), 141-165.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(6), 1216-1229.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*(1), 26-42. 361
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist, 48*(1), 26-34.
- Goldstein, A. P. (1981). *Psychological skill training: The structured learning technique*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Gottlieb, G. (1998). Normally occurring environmental and behavioral influences on gene activity: From central dogma to probabilistic epigenesis. *Psychological Review, 105*(4), 792-802.
- Gow, A. J., Whiteman, M. C., Pattie, A., & Deary, I. J. (2005). Goldberg's 'IPIP' Big-Five factor markers: Internal consistency and concurrent validation in Scotland. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*(2), 317-329.
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data*. Prentice Hall Press.
- Greg, P. (2009). *How do I know if an assessment is reliable? (Part 3)*. Retrieved from <http://blog.questionmark.com/psychometrics-101-how-do-i-know-if-an-assessment-is-reliable-part-3>.
- Gregersen, T. S. (2003). To err is human: A reminder to teachers of language-anxious students. *Foreign Language Annals, 36*(1), 25-32.
- Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(4), 562-570.

- Greenberg, J. & Mitchell, S. (1983). *Object relations in psychoanalytic theory*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Griffiths, R. (1991). Personality and second-language learning: Theory, research and practice. In E. Sadtano (Ed.), *Language acquisition and the second/foreign language classroom* (pp. 103-135). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Grigorenko, E. L. (2002). *In search of the genetic engram of personality*. Guilford Press.
- Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2009). *Survey methodology* (2nd Ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Güleç, C. (2006). *Psikiyatrinin A-B-C'si*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Gülgöz, S. (2002). Five-factor model and NEO-PI-R in Turkey. In *The five-factor model of personality across cultures* (pp. 175-196). Springer US.
- Gültekin, E. (2009). *Polislerin Temel Kişilik Özelliklerinin İş Başarısı Üzerine Etkisi*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Günay, E. (2011). *The effects of using the internet on individual's socialization based on personality traits*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Gürsel, G. (2009). *The relationship between English instructors' negotiation strategies and personality traits*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Hadziosmanovic, L. (2012). *Students' perspective on speaking anxiety and dynamics in the ESL classroom*. Unpublished Degree Paper, University Of Malmö, Sweden.
- Hahn, D. W., Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (1999). A factor analysis of the most frequently used Korean personality trait adjectives. *European Journal of Personality*, 13(4), 261-282.
- Hair, J. F., Bush, R. P., & Ortinau, D. J. (2006). *Marketing research: Within a changing information environment* (3rd Ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill/ Irwin.
- Hampson, S. E. (1988). *The construction of personality* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hans, J. B. (2000). *Difference between reliability testing and durability testing*. Retrieved from <http://www.multiface.com/RvsDTest.PDF>.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.

- Harris, D. P. (1969). *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review*, 102(3), 458.
- Hashimoto, T. (2002). The constructive approach to the dynamic view of language. In A. Cangelosi, & D. Parisi, (Eds.), *Simulating the evolution of language* (pp. 307-324). Springer London.
- Hatch, E. M. (1978). *Second language acquisition: A book of readings*. Newbury House Pub.
- Head, L. Q., Engley, E., & Knight, C. B. (1991). The effects of trait anxiety on state anxiety and perception of test difficulty for undergraduates administered high and low difficulty tests. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 18, 65-70.
- Heaven, P. C. (1990). Attitudinal and personality correlates of achievement motivation among high school students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11(7), 705-710.
- Heine, S. J., Kitayama, S., Lehman, D. R., Takata, T., Ide, E., Leung, C., ... Matsumoto, H. (2001). Divergent consequences of success and failure in Japan and North America: An investigation of self-improving motivations and malleable selves. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 81(4), 599-615.
- Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Peng, K., & Greenholtz, J. (2002). What's wrong with cross-cultural comparisons of subjective Likert-scale scales?: The reference-group effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 903-918.
- Heine, S. J., Takemoto, T., Moskalkenko, S., Lasaleta, J., & Heinrich, J. (2008). Mirrors in the head: Cultural variation in objective self-awareness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(7), 879-887.
- Heiman, N., Stallings, M. C., Young, S. E., & Hewitt, J. K. (2004). Investigating the genetic and environmental structure of Cloninger's personality dimensions in adolescence. *Twin Research*, 7(05), 462-470.
- Hendriks, A. J., Hofstee, W. K., & De Raad, B. (1999). The five-factor personality inventory (FFPI). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27(2), 307-325.
- Hendry, J. (2003). *Understanding Japanese society* (3rd Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Henry, G. T. (2013). *Practical sampling: Sample size*. SAGE Research Methods.

- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94(3), 319-340.
- Higgins, E. T., Roney, C. J., Crowe, E., & Hymes, C. (1994). Ideal versus ought predilections for approach and avoidance: Distinct self-regulatory systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(2), 276-286.
- Hilleson, M. (1996). "I want to talk with them, but I don't want them to hear": An introspective study of second language anxiety in an English-medium school. *Voices from the Language Classroom: Qualitative Research in Second Language Education*, 248-275.
- Hodapp, V., Glanzmann, P. G., & Laux, L. (1995). Theory and measurement of test anxiety as a situation-specific trait. In C. D. Spielberger & P. R. Vagg (Eds.), *Test anxiety: Theory, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 47-59). Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Francis.
- Hofstede, G. (2007). A European in Asia. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(1), 16-21.
- Hogan, R. T. (1986). *Hogan personality inventory*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Homayouni, A. (2011). Personality traits and emotional intelligence as predictors of learning English and Math. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 839-843.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1989). Facing the blackboard: Student perceptions of language learning and the language classroom. *ADFL Bulletin*, 20(3), 61-64.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2000). It ain't over'til it's over: On foreign language anxiety, first language deficits, and the confounding of variables. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(2), 256-259.
- Horwitz, E. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112-126.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132.
- Horwitz, E. K., & Young, D. J. (1991). *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*. Pearson College Div.

- Howard, J. B., (2010). *Extraversion and oral proficiency in ESL*. Master's Thesis, Louisiana State University, Louisiana.
- Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), 343-356.
- Hsu, F. L. (1971). Psychosocial homeostasis and jen: Conceptual tools for advancing psychological anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 73(1), 23-44.
- Huang, J. (1998). *Students' learning difficulties in a second language speaking classroom*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Huang, H. (2004). *The relationship between learning motivation and speaking anxiety among EFL non-English major freshmen in Taiwan*. Master's Thesis, Chaoyang University of Technology, Taiwan.
- Huang, S. C., & Chang, S. F. (1996). Self-efficacy of English as a second language learner: An example of four learners. *ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 396536*.
- Hughes, R. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Speaking*. Routledge.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua-journal of Cross-cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8(2-3), 223-248.
- Isaka, H. (1990). Factor analysis of trait terms in everyday Japanese language. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11(2), 115-124.
- Iwawaki, S., Eysenck, S. B. G., & Eysenck, H. J. (1980). Japanese and English personality structure-a cross-cultural-study. *Psychologia*, 23(4), 195-205.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five inventory-versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy. *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, 3, 114-158.

- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, 2(1999), 102-138.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2nd Ed.). Boston, MA: Ally & Bacon.
- Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999). The big five personality traits, general mental ability, and career success across the life span. *Personnel psychology*, 52(3), 621-652.
- Kahveci, H. (2001). *Yardım arama davranışları ile fatalistik düşünce ve beş faktör kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin araştırılması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Trabzon.
- Kanfer, R., Ackerman, P. L., & Heggstad, E. D. (1996). Motivational skills & self-regulation for learning: A trait perspective. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8(3), 185-209.
- Kao, P. C. (2012). Exploring personality traits and loneliness in university EFL (English as a foreign language) learners. *New Educational Review*, 30(4), 236-245.
- Kao, P. C., & Craigie, P. (2014). Effects of English usage on Facebook and personality traits on achievement of students learning English as a foreign language. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(1), 17-24.
- Kaplan, R. B. (2010). *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Kappe, R., & van der Flier, H. (2010). Using multiple and specific criteria to assess the predictive validity of the Big Five personality factors on academic performance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(1), 142-145.
- Karami, H. (2001). *Extraversion-introversion and grammatical knowledge*. Master's Thesis, Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran.
- Kashiwagi, S. (2002). Japanese adjective list for the Big Five. *Big Five assessment*, 305-326.
- Kashiwagi, S. (1999). The trait theoretic evaluation of the TEG from the view point of the five-factor model. *The Japanese Journal of Psychology*, 69, 468-477.

- Kashiwagi, S., & Wada, S. (1996). A study on the concurrent validity of personality inventory from the view of the five-factor model concerning personality traits. *The Japanese Journal of Psychology*, 69(4), 300-307.
- Kashiwagi, S., Wada, S., & Aoki, T. (1993). The Big Five and the oblique primary pattern for the items of the ACL, Japan version. *The Japanese Journal of Psychology*, 64(2), 153-159.
- Kashiwagi, S., & Yamada, K. (1995). Evaluation of the Uchida-Kraepelin test based on the five factor model of personality traits. *The Japanese Journal of Psychology*, 66(1), 24-32.
- Kaya, M. (1995). *The relationship of motivation, anxiety, self-confidence and extroversion, introversion to students' active class participation in an EFL classroom in Turkey*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Keller, H., & Zach, U. (2002). Gender and birth order as determinants of parental behaviour. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 26(2), 177-184.
- Khan, Z. A. & Zafar, S. (2010). The effects of anxiety on cognitive processing in English language learning. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 199- 209.
- Kiany, G. R., (1997). *Extraversion and pedagogical setting as sources of variation in different aspects of English proficiency*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Essex, UK.
- Kiany, G. R. (1998). English proficiency and academic achievement in relation to extraversion: A preliminary study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 113-130.
- Kim, M. R. (2005). The relationship of social anxiety with identity, public self-consciousness, and interdependent self: A comparative study of Korean and Japanese university students. *The Japanese Journal of Personality*, 14(1), 42-53.
- King, L. A., Walker, L. M., & Broyles, S. J. (1996). Creativity and the five-factor model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 30(2), 189-203.
- Kirkland, B. (1984). Talking Faster Sooner. *TESL Talk*, 15, 68-72.
- Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 549-566.

- Kitayama, S., & Uchida, Y. (2003). Explicit self-criticism and implicit self-regard: Evaluating self and friend in two cultures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*(5), 476-482.
- Kitayama, S., Snibbe, A. C., Markus, H. R., & Suzuki, T. (2004). Is there any “free” choice? Self and dissonance in two cultures. *Psychological Science, 15*(8), 527-533.
- Kleinmann, H. H. (1977). Avoidance behavior in adult second language acquisition. *Language learning, 27*(1), 93-107.
- Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Koch, A. A., & Terrell, T. D. (1991). Affective reactions of foreign language students to natural approach activities and teaching techniques. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 109-126). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kohn, A. (1999). *Punished by rewards the trouble with gold stars, incentive plans, A's, praise, and other bribes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Komarraju, M., & Karau, S. J. (2005). The relationship between the Big Five personality traits and academic motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*(3), 557-567.
- Komarraju, M., Karau, S. J., & Schmeck, R. R. (2009). Role of the Big Five personality traits in predicting college students' academic motivation and achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 19*(1), 47-52.
- Köksal, O., Arslan, C., & Bakla, A. (2014). An Investigation into Foreign Language Learning Anxiety, Stress and Personality in Higher Education. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*.
- Köse, D. (2005). *Impact of dialogue journals on language anxiety and classroom affect*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Kubanyiova, M. (2006). Developing a motivational teaching practice in EFL teachers in Slovakia: Challenges of promoting teacher change in EFL contexts. *TESL-EJ, 10*(2), 1-17.

- Kubanyiova, M. (2009). Possible selves in language teacher development. *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, 314-332.
- Labouvie-Vief, G., Diehl, M., Tarnowski, A., & Shen, J. (2000). Age differences in adult personality: Findings from the United States and China. *JOURNALS OF GERONTOLOGY SERIES B*, 55(1), P4-P17.
- Laidra, K., Pullmann, H., & Allik, J. (2007). Personality and intelligence as predictors of academic achievement: A cross-sectional study from elementary to secondary school. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(3), 441-451.
- Lalonde, R. N., & Gardner, R. C. (1984). Investigating a causal model of second language acquisition: Where does personality fit in? *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 16(4), 224-237.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1995). *Social anxiety*. New York: Guilford.
- Leaver, B. L., Ehrman, M. E., & Shekhtman, B., (2005). *Achieving success in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Larkin, K. C. (1984). Relation of self-efficacy expectations to academic achievement and persistence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31(3), 356.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1989) *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Lewis, C. A., Francis, L. J., Shevlin, M., & Forrest, S. (2002). Confirmatory factor analysis of the French translation of the abbreviated form of the revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18(2), 79-85.
- Lewontin, R. (2000). *The triple helix: Gene, organism, and environment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ligthbown, M. P., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liu, M. (2006). Anxiety in Chinese EFL students at different proficiency levels. *System*, 34(3), 301-316.

- Liu, M., & Huang, W. (2011). An exploration of foreign language anxiety and English learning motivation. *Education Research International*, 1-8.
- Liu, M. & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 71-86.
- Liyanage, I., & Bartlett, B. (2013). Personality types and languages learning strategies: Chameleons changing colours. *System*, 41(3), 598-608.
- Llinas, M. M., & Garau, J. M. (2009). Effects of language anxiety on three proficiency-level courses of Spanish as a foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(1), 94-111.
- Lo, A. W., Mamaysky, H., & Wang, J. (2000). Foundations of technical analysis: Computational algorithms, statistical inference, and empirical implementation. *The Journal of Finance*, 55(4), 1705-1770.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input1. *Applied linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141.
- Louma, S. (2009). *Assessing speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lounsbury, J.W., Gibson, L.W., Sundstrom, E., Wilburn, D., & Loveland, J.M. (2004). An empirical investigation of the proposition that „school is work“: A comparison of personality-performance correlations in school and work settings. *Journal of Education and Work*, 17, 119-131.
- Lun, V. M. C., & Bond, M. H. (2006). Achieving relationship harmony in groups and its consequence for group performance. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 9(3), 195-202.
- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 4(1), 84.
- MacDonald, J. R., Clément, R., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a L2 in a bilingual context: A qualitative investigation of Anglophone and Francophone students. *Unpublished manuscript, Cape Breton University, Sydney, Nova Scotia, Canada*, 1-29.

- MacIntyre, P. D. (1995). How does anxiety affect second language learning? A reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(1), 90-99.
- MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language learning: A review of literature. *Language Learning*, 41(1), 85-117.
- MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1993). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the SL. *Language Learning*, 44(3), 283-305.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The effects of induced anxiety on three stages of cognitive processing in computerized vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16(01), 1-17.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Gardner, R. C., & Clément, R. (1997). Biases in self-ratings of second language proficiency: The role of language anxiety. *Language Learning*, 47(2), 265-287.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15(1), 3-26.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545-562.
- Maddux, J. E. (1995). Self-efficacy theory. In J. M. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and adaptation* (pp. 3-33). Springer US.
- Maddux, J. M., & Meier, L. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and depression. In J. M. Maddux (Ed.), *Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and adaptation* (pp.143-169). Springer US.
- Madsen, H. S., Brown, B. L., & Jones, R. L. (1991). Evaluating student attitudes toward second-language tests. In E. K. Horwitz, & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp.65-86). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Maehr, M. L., & Pintrich, P. R. (Eds.). (1997). *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 10, pp. 1-49). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Magogwe, J. M., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System*, 35(3), 338-352.
- Mahyuddin, R., Elias, H., Cheong, L. S., Muhamad, M. F., Noordin, N., & Abdullah, M. C. (2006). The relationship between students' self-efficacy and their English language achievement. *Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan*, 21, 61-71.
- Malhotra, N. K, Baalbaki I. B. & Bechwati N. B. (2014). *Marketing research* (6th Ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Malkoç, A. (2011). Big five personality traits and coping styles predict subjective well-being: A study with a Turkish sample. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 577-581.
- Mason, M. (2010, August). Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. In *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (Vol. 11, No. 3).
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41(9), 954.
- Marlar, M. R. & Joubert, C. E. (2002). Liking of personal names, self-esteem and the Big Five inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 91(2), 407-410.
- Maslow, A. H. (1964). *Toward a psychology of being*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and predictors of performance in the foreign language classroom. *System*, 32(1), 21-36.
- Matthews, G., Deary, I. J., & Whiteman M. C. (2009). *Personality traits*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- May, R. (1977). *The meaning of anxiety*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- McCarthy, M. J. & O'Keeffe, A. (2006). Second language speaking. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of language and linguistics* (pp. 95-101). Oxford: Elsevier.
- McCombs, B. L. (2001). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A phenomenological view. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated*

- learning and academic achievement: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 67-123). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- McCrae, R. R. (2000). Trait psychology and the revival of personality and culture studies. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44(1), 10-31.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1985). Openness to experience. *Perspectives in Personality*, 1, 145-172.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81-90.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5), 509-516.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa Jr, P. T., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., Hřebíčková, M., Avia, M. D., ... Saunders, P. R. (2000). Nature over nurture: Temperament, personality, and life span development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(1), 173-186.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, Jr, P. T., (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five factor theory perspective* (2nd Ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (2007). Brief versions of the NEO-PI-3. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 28(3), 116-128.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 175-215.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research*, 4(1), 78-96.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. *Personality and Interpersonal Communication*, 6, 1-11.
- McElroy, J. C., Hendrickson, A. R., Townsend, A. M., & DeMarie, S. M. (2007). Dispositional factors in internet use: Personality versus cognitive style. *MIS Quarterly*, 809-820.
- Mejías, H., Applbaum, R. L., Applbaum, S. J., & Trotter, R. T. (1991). Oral communication apprehension and Hispanics: An exploration of oral communication

- apprehension among Mexican American students in Texas. *Language anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*, 87-97.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods*. Glendale.
- Mete, Cengiz (2006). *İlköğretim Okullarında Çalışan Öğretmenlerin Kişilik Özellikleri İle İş Tatminleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*. Master's Thesis, Yeditepe University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Mlačić, B., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). An analysis of a cross-cultural personality inventory: The IPIP Big-Five factor markers in Croatia. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 88(2), 168-177.
- Moody, R. (1988). Personality preferences and foreign language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(4), 389-401.
- Moore, K., & McElroy, J. C. (2012). The influence of personality on Facebook usage, wall postings, and regret. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(1), 267-274.
- Morsunbul, U. (2014). The validity and reliability study of the Turkish version of quick big five personality test. *Dusunen Adam*, 27(4), 316.
- Mosier, S. M. (1997). *Self-efficacy enhancement: A nursing approach to weight management*. Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Arizona University, USA.
- Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 18, 30-38.
- Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H. H. & Todesco, A., (1975). *The good language learner*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Narvaez, D., Gleason, T., Wang, L., Brooks, J., Lefever, J. B., & Cheng, Y. (2013). The evolved development niche: Longitudinal effects of caregiving practices on early childhood psychosocial development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 28(4), 759-773.
- Neuman, G. A. & Wright, J. (1999). Team effectiveness: Beyond skills and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 376-389.

- Noftle, E. E., & Robins, R. W. (2007). Personality predictors of academic outcomes: Big Five correlates of GPA and SAT scores. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(1), 116-130.
- Noguchi, K. (2007). Examination of the content of individualism/collectivism scales in cultural comparisons of the USA and Japan. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(3), 131-144.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66(6), 574-583.
- Noormohamadi, R. (2009). On the relationship between language learning strategies and foreign language anxiety. *Pan-pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 39-52.
- Nunan, D. (2006). *Task-based language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- O'Brien, T. B., & DeLongis, A. (1996). The interactional context of problem-, emotion-, and relationship-focused coping: the role of the big five personality factors. *Journal of personality*, 64(4), 775-813.
- O'Connor, M. C., & Paunonen, S. V. (2007). Big Five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(5), 971-990.
- Ohata, K. (2005). Language anxiety from the teacher's perspective: Interviews with seven experienced ESL/EFL teachers. *Journal of Language Learning*, 3(1), 133-155.
- Olivares-Cuhat, G. (2013). Relative importance of learning variables on L2 performance. *Linguistik online*, 43(3), 99-116.
- Ong, E. Y., Ang, R. P., Ho, J. C., Lim, J. C., Goh, D. H., Lee, C. S., ... Chua, A. Y. (2011). Narcissism, extraversion and adolescents' self-presentation on Facebook. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(2), 180-185.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (1997). Writing a research proposal: The role of library anxiety, statistics anxiety, and composition anxiety. *Library and Information Science Research*, 19(1), 5-33.

- Ordun, G. (2002). *Örgütsel tutumların çalışan davranışına etkisinin incelenmesine ve analizine yönelik bir çalışma*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Ortiz, F. A., Church, T. A., de Jesus Vargas-Flores, J., Ibanez-Reyes, J., Flores-Galaz, M., Iuit-Briceno, J. I., ... Escamilla, J. M. (2007). Are indigenous personality dimensions culture-specific? Mexican inventories and the five-factor model. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*(3), 618-649.
- Oswald, F. L., Schmitt, N., Kim, B. H., Ramsay, L. J., & Gillespie, M. A. (2004). Developing a biodata measure and situational judgment inventory as predictors of college student performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*(2), 187.
- Oxford, R. L., & Ehrman, M. (1992). Second language research on individual differences. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 188-205.
- Oxford, R., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(3), 291-300.
- Oz, H. (2014). Big Five personality traits and willingness to communicate among foreign language learners in Turkey. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 42*(9), 1473-1482ç
- Öner, M. İ. (2012). *The relationship between EFL instructors' classroom management efficacy and personality traits*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Öztürk, G. (2012). *Foreign language speaking anxiety and learner motivaton: A case study at a Turkish state university*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2013). The impact of gender on foreign language speaking anxiety and motivation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 654-665.
- Öztürk, G., & Gürbüz, N. (2014). Speaking anxiety among Turkish EFL learners: The case at a state university. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 10*(1), 1-17.
- Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 543-578.
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS Survival Manual*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Pappamihiel, N. E. (2002). English as a second language students and English language anxiety: Issues in the mainstream classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 36(3), 327-355.
- Park, R. (2004). Development in the family. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 365-399.
- Park, H., & Lee, A. R. (2005). L2 learners' anxiety, self-confidence and oral performance. *Proceedings of Panpacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 10th Conference, Edinburgh*, 197-208.
- Patterson, E. S., Roth, E. M., & Woods, D. D. (2001). Predicting vulnerabilities in computer-supported inferential analysis under data overload. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 3(4), 224-237.
- Paulhus, D. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17-59). New York: Academic Press.
- Paulhus, D. L., Trapnell, P. D., & Chen, D. (1999). Birth order effects on personality and achievement within families. *Psychological Science*, 10(6), 482-488.
- Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001). Big Five predictors of academic achievement. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35(1), 78-90.
- Payne, S. C., Youngcourt, S. S., & Beaubien, J. M. (2007). A meta-analytic examination of the goal orientation nomological net. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 128-150.
- Peabody, D., & Goldberg, L. R. (1989). Some determinants of factor structures from personality-trait descriptors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(3), 552-567.
- Peabody, D., & De Raad, B. (2002). The substantive nature of psycholexical personality factors: A comparison across languages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 983-997.
- Perera, M., & Eysenck, S. B. G., (1984). A cross-cultural study of personality Sri Lanka and England. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15(3), 353-371.
- Pfeiffer, T., Bertram, L., & Ioannidis, J. P. (2011). Quantifying selective reporting and the Proteus phenomenon for multiple datasets with similar bias. *PLoS One*, 6(3), e18362.

- Phillips, E. M. (1991). Anxiety and oral competence: Classroom dilemma. *The French Review*, 65(1), 1-14.
- Phillips, E. M. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on students' oral test performance and attitudes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76(1), 169-176.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (1996). *Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Plomin, R. & Caspi, A. (1999). Behavioral genetics and personality. In L.A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 251-276). New York: Guilford Press.
- Plomin, R., & Daniels, D. (1987). Why are children in the same family so different from one another? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 10(01), 1-16.
- Polit D. F. & Hungler B. P. (1999) *Nursing research: Principles and methods* (6th Ed.) Philadelphia, Lippincott.
- Porter, S. & Carter, D. E. (2000) Common terms and concepts in research. In D. Cormack (Ed.), *The research process in nursing* (4th Ed.) (p. 17). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Pourfeiz, J. (2015). Exploring the relationship between global personality traits and attitudes toward foreign language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 467-473.
- Price, M. L. (1991). The subjective experience of foreign language anxiety: Interviews with highly anxious students. In E. K. Horwitz, & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 101-108). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pulver, A., Allik, J., Pulkkinen, L., & Hämäläinen, M. (1995). A Big Five personality inventory in two non-Indo-European languages. *European Journal of Personality*, 9(2), 109-124.
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2005). Short version of the Big Five inventory (BFI-K): Development and validation of an economic inventory for assessment of the five factors of personality. *Diagnostica*, 51(4), 195-206.

- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality, 41*(1), 203-212.
- Rastegar, M. (2002). The effect of self-esteem, extraversion and risk-taking on EFL proficiency of TEFL students. *Journal of the Faculty of Letters and Humanities, 10*, 9-35.
- Reiss, M. A. (1983). Helping the unsuccessful language learner. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 39*(2), 257-66.
- Reynolds, S. K. & Clark, L. A. (2001). Predicting dimensions of personality disorder from domains and facets of the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality, 69*(2), 199-222.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. UK: Longman.
- Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., & Sawyer, B. E. (2004). Primary-grade teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, attitudes toward teaching, and discipline and teaching practice priorities in relation to the "responsive classroom" approach. *The Elementary School Journal, 321*-341.
- Robinson, D., Gabriel, N., & Katchan, O. (1994). Personality and second language learning. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16*(1), 143-157. [http://10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)90118-X](http://10.1016/0191-8869(94)90118-X)
- Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of science* (pp. 184– 256). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rogers, J. (2007). *Adults learning*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Ross, S. R., Rausch, M. K., & Canada, K. E. (2003). Competition and cooperation in the five-factor model: Individual differences in achievement orientation. *The Journal of Psychology, 137*(4), 323-337.
- Rost, M., & Ross, S. (1991). Learner use of strategies in interaction: Typology and teachability. *Language learning, 41*(2), 235-268.

- Rothstein, M. G., Paunonen, S. V., Rush, J. C., & King, G. A. (1994). Personality and cognitive ability predictors of performance in graduate business school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 86*(4), 516-530.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 80*(1), 1-28.
- Rowe, D. C. (1999). Heredity. In V. J. Derlega, B. A. Winstead & W. H. Jones (Eds.), *Personality: Contemporary theory and research* (pp. 66-100). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "good language learner" can teach us. *TESOL quarterly, 41*-51.
- Rubinstein, G. (2005). The Big Five among male and female students of different faculties. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*(7), 1495-1503.
- Rusten, J. (Ed.) (1993). *Theophrastus: Characters*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sahai, H., & Khurshid, A. (1996). Formulae and tables for the determination of sample sizes and power in clinical trials for testing differences in proportions for the two-sample design: A review. *Statistics in Medicine, 15*(1), 1-21.
- Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(2), 239-249.
- Salim A. (2004). Teacher's Role, Learner's Gender Differences, and FL Anxiety Among Seventh-Grade Students Studying English as a FL. *Educational Psychology, 24*, 711-721.
- Saltan, F. (2003). *EFL speaking anxiety: How do students and teachers perceive it?* Master's Thesis, METU, Ankara.
- Sansigiry, S. S., & Sail, K. (2006). Effect of students' perception of course loads on test anxiety. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 70*(2), 1-6.
- Sarıçoban, A. (1994). *An Analysis of the relationship between personality factors (extroversion-introversion and the level of social adjustment) and foreign language achievement*. Doctoral Dissertation, Çukurova University, Adana.
- Saucier, G., Hampton, S. E., & Goldberg, L. R. (2000). The language of personality: Lexical perspectives on the five-factor model. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor*

- model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 21-50). New York: Guilford Press.
- Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Schmidt, L.A., & Fox, N.A. (2002). Individual differences in childhood shyness: Origins, malleability and developmental course. In D. Cervone & W. Mischel (Eds.), *Advances in personality science* (pp. 83-105). New York, USA: Guilford Press.
- Schulze, P., & Schulze, J. (2003). Believing is achieving: The implications of self-efficacy research for family and consumer sciences education. *AAFCS Monograph: Research Applications in Family and Consumer Sciences*, 105-113.
- Schunk, D. H. (2001). Social cognitive theory and self-regulated learning. In B. J. Zimmerman, & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 125-151). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 159-172.
- Schunk, D. H., & Hanson, A. R. (1985). Peer models: Influence on children's self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(3), 313.
- Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning*, 28(1), 129-142.
- Sena, W. J., Lowe, P., & Lee, S. W. (2007). Significant predictors of test anxiety among students with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 40(4), 360-376.
- Sharp, A. (2009). Personality and second language learning. *Asian Social Science*, 4(11), 17-25.
- Shih, H. F., Chen, S. H. E., Chen, S. C., & Wey, S. C. (2013). The relationship among tertiary level EFL students' personality, online learning motivation and online learning satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 103, 1152-1160.

- Shimizu, K. (1999). A survey of expectations of and characteristics attributed to native-speaker English teachers and Japanese English teachers by Japanese university students. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, (3), 53-74.
- Shumin, K. (1997). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. *English Teaching Forum*, 35(3), 8-13.
- Simon, G. (2009). *Multiple regression basics*. [Lecture notes]. Retrieved from <http://people.stern.nyu.edu/wgreene/Statistics/MultipleRegressionBasicsCollection.pdf>
- Skoretz, Y. M. (2011). *A study of the impact of a school-based job-embedded professional development program on elementary and middle school teacher efficacy for technology integration*. Doctoral Dissertation, Marshall University Graduate School of Education and Professional Development, West Virginia.
- Smart, J. C., Elton, C. F., & Burnett, C. W. (1970). Underachiever's and overachievers in intermediate French. *The Modern Language Journal*, 54(6), 415-420. <http://doi:10.2307/322830>.
- Smith, S. M., & Albaum, G. S. (2012). Basic marketing research (Vol. 1). Handbook for Research Professionals. *Provo: Qualtrics Labs Inc.*
- Somer, O. (1998). *Türkçe'de kişilik özelliği tanımlayan sıfatların yapısı ve Beş Faktör Modeli*. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 13(42), 17-32.
- Somer, O. & Goldberg, L. R. (1999). The structure of Turkish trait-descriptive adjectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(3), 431-450.
- Somer, O., Korkmaz, M. & Tatar, A. (2002). Beş Faktör Kişilik Envanteri'nin Geliştirilmesi - I: Ölçek ve Alt Ölçeklerin Oluşturulması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 17(49), 21-33.
- Somer, O., Korkmaz, M. & Tatar, A. (2004). *Kuramdan uygulamaya Beş Faktör Kişilik Modeli ve Beş Faktör Kişilik Envanteri (5FKE)*. Ege Üniversitesi Basımevi, Bornova, İzmir.
- Songsiri, M. (2007). *An action research study of promoting students' confidence in speaking English*. Doctoral Dissertation, School of Arts, Education and Human Development, Victoria University, Australia.

- Soto, C. J., John, O. P., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). The developmental psychometrics of Big Five self-reports: Acquiescence, factor structure, coherence, and differentiation from ages 10 to 20. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(4), 718.
- Sparks, R. L., Ganschow, L., & Javorsky, J. (2000). Déjà vu all over again: A response to Saito, Horwitz, and Garza. *The Modern Language Journal, 84*(2), 251-255.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1972). *State anxiety as an emotional state*. In C. D. Spielberger (Ed.), *Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research*. New York: Academic Press.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Stagner, R. (1961). *Psychology of personality* (3rd Ed.) New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Stelmack, R. M., & Stalikas, A. (1991). Galen and the humour theory of temperament. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*(3), 255-263.
- Stevens, S. S. (1946). On the theory of scales of measurement. *Science, New Series, 103*(2684), (677-680).
- Strelau, J. (1998). *Temperament: A psychological perspective*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Sudak, M. K. & Zehir, C. (2013). Kişilik Tipleri, Duygusal Zeka, İş Tatmini İlişkisi Üzerine Yapılan Bir Araştırma. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 11*(22), 141-165.
- Swanberg, A. B., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2010). Personality, approaches to learning and achievement. *Educational Psychology, 30*(1), 75-88.
- Şakrak, G. (2009). *The relationship between emotional intelligence and foreign language anxiety in Turkish EFL students*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>.
- Şeker, M. (2011). *Kişilik Özellikleri İle Örgütsel Bağlılık ve İşgören Performansı Arasındaki İlişkiler ve Kayseri Eğitim ve Araştırma Hastanesi'nde Bir Uygulama*. Master's Thesis, Niğde University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Niğde.
- Şenler, B. (2011). *Pre-service science teachers' self-efficacy in relation to personality traits and academic self-regulation*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>

- Şirin, E. (2012). *Kişilik, lider-üye etkileşimi ve çalışan sonuçları*, Master's Thesis, Graduate School of Social Sciences, High Technology Institute, Gebze.
- Takač, V. P., & Požega, D. (2012). Personality traits, willingness to communicate and oral proficiency in English as a foreign language. In L. Pon, V. Karabaliş, & S. Cimer (Eds.), *Applied linguistics today: Research and perspectives* (pp. 67-82). Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Taggar, S., Hackew, R., & Saha, S. (1999). Leadership emergence in autonomous work teams: Antecedents and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(4), 899-926. <http://DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00184.x>
- Tam, M. (1997). Building fluency: A course for non-native speakers of English. *English Teaching Forum*, 35(1), 26.
- Tanveer, M. (2007). *Investigations of the factors that cause language anxiety for ESL/EFL learners in learning speaking skills and the influence it casts on communication in the target language*. Master's Thesis, University of Glasgow, Scotland.
- Taylor-Powell, E. (1998). Questionnaire design: Asking questions with a purpose. *University of Wisconsin Extension*.
- Templin, S. A. (1999). The relationship between self-efficacy and language learners' grades. *JALT Journal*, 21(1), 112-124.
- Templin, S. A., Guile, T. C., & Okuma, T. (2001). *Creating a reliable and valid self-efficacy questionnaire and English test to raise learners L2 achievement via raising their self-efficacy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Japanese Association for Language Teaching, Shizouka, Japan.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1934). The vectors of the mind. *Psychological Review*, 41(1), 1-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0075959>
- Thomas, J. C. & Segal, D. (2006). *Comprehensive handbook of personality and psychopathology*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Thornbury, S. (2006). *How to teach vocabulary*. Pearson Education India.
- Tilfarlioglu, F. Y., & Ciftci, F. S. (2011). Supporting self-efficacy and learner autonomy in relation to academic success in EFL classrooms (a case study). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(10), 1284-1294.

- Tompkins, G. E. (1998). *Language arts: Content and teaching strategies*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Topçu, S. (1976). *Psychological concomitants of aggressive feelings and behaviour*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of London, London. U.K.
- Trapmann, S., Hell, B., Hirn, J. O. W., & Schuler, H. (2007). Meta-analysis of the relationship between the Big Five and academic success at university. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, 215(2), 132-151.
- Tsai, C. C. (2013). The impact of foreign language anxiety, test anxiety, and self-efficacy among senior high school students in Taiwan. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 1(2), 31-47.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 202-248.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 944-956.
- Tsiplakides, I., & Keramida, A. (2009). Helping students overcome foreign language speaking anxiety in the English classroom: Theoretical issues and practical recommendations. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 39-44.
- Tsui, A. B. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. *Voices from the Language Classroom*, 145-167.
- Tucker, G. R., Hamayan, E. & Genasee, F. H. (1976). Affective, cognitive and social factors in second language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32(3), 214-226.
- Ulu, I. P. (2007). *An investigation of adaptive and maladaptive dimensions of perfectionism in relation to adult attachment and big five personality traits*. Doctoral Dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Zeiders, K. H., & Updegraff, K. A. (2013). Family ethnic socialization and ethnic identity: A family-driven, youth-driven, or reciprocal process?. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(1), 137-146.
- Ur, P. (2008). *Discussion that work*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Van Hemert, D. A., Van de Vijver, F. J., Poortinga, Y. H., & Georgas, J. (2002). Structural and functional equivalence of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire within and between countries. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(8), 1229-1249. [http://DOI: 10.1016/S0191-8869\(02\)00007-7](http://DOI: 10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00007-7)
- Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (2002). Communicative competence and personality dimensions in first and second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23(3), 361-374.
- Von Worde, R. (2003). Students' perspectives on foreign language anxiety. *Inquiry*, 8(1), 27-44.
- Wada, S. (1996). Construction of the Big Five scales of personality trait items and concurrent validity with NPI. *Japanese Journal of Personality*, 67(1), 61-67.
- Wakamoto, N., (2007). *The impact of extroversion/introversion and associated learner strategies on English language comprehension in a Japanese EFL setting*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada.
- Wang, N. (1998). *Beliefs about language learning and foreign language anxiety: A study of university students learning English as a foreign language in Mainland China*. Master's Thesis, University of Victoria, British Columbia.
- Wang, C. (2004). *Self-regulated learning strategies and self-efficacy beliefs of children learning English as a second language*. Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Ohio.
- Wang, C., & Pape, S. J. (2007). A probe into three Chinese boys' self-efficacy beliefs learning English as a second language. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 21(4), 364-377.
- Wang, D., Cui, H., & Zhou, F. (2005). Measuring the personality of Chinese: QZPS versus NEO PI-R. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 8(1), 97-122.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1992). Affects separable and inseparable: On the hierarchical arrangement of the negative effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(3), 489-505.
- Williams, M. & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Wilson, S. T. J. (2006). *Anxiety in learning English as a foreign language: Its associations with student variables, with oral proficiency, and with performance on an oral test*. Doctoral dissertation, Universidad de Granada, Granada, Spain.
- Wilson, R. G., & Lynn, R. (1990). Personality, intelligence components and foreign language attainment. *Educational Psychology, 10*(1), 57-71. <http://doi:10.1080/0144341900100105>
- Wilson, K., Fornasier, S., & White, K. M. (2010). Psychological predictors of young adults' use of social networking sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 13*(2), 173-177. <http://doi:10.1089/cyber.2009.0094>
- Wilz, B. (2000). *Relationship between personality type and Grade Point Average of technical college students*. Master's Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Wisconsin.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Wolfgang, G. (2005). *Relationships between the two dimensions of adult attachment theory and the five factor theory of personality*. Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Akron, Ohio.
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *Regional Language Centre Journal, 37*(3), 308-328.
- Worrell, F. C., & Cross Jr, W. E. (2004). The reliability and validity of Big Five inventory scores with African American college students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*(1), 18.
- Wright, J. C., & Mischel, W. (1987). A conditional approach to dispositional constructs: The local predictability of social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(6), 1159-1177.
- Yan, J. X., & Horwitz, E. K. (2008). Learners' perceptions of how anxiety interacts with personal and instructional factors to influence their achievement in English: A qualitative analysis of EFL learners in China. *Language Learning, 58*(1), 151-183.
- Yanardöner, E. (2010). *The relationship between learning styles and personality traits of students from Boğaziçi university faculty of education*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr>.

- Yang, K. S., & Bond, M. H. (1990). Exploring implicit personality theories with indigenous or imported constructs: The Chinese case. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(6), 1087-1095.
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 54-66. [http://http://doi.org/bh4g2f](http://doi.org/bh4g2f)
- Yelboğa, A. (2006). Kişilik Özellikleri ve İş Performansı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. “İş, Güç” *Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 8(2), 196-211.
- Yıldırım, H. (2003). *Empati ile beş faktör kişilik modeli arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Trabzon.
- Yılmaz, C. (2010). The relationship between language learning strategies, gender, proficiency and self-efficacy beliefs: a study of ELT learners in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 682-687.
- Yik, M. S. M., Russell, J. A., Ahn, C. K., Dols, J. M. F., & Suzuki, N. (2002). Relating the five-factor model of personality to a circumflex model of affect. In R. R. McCrae & J. Allik (Eds.), *The five-factor model of personality across cultures* (pp. 74-104). Springer US.
- Ying, H. H. (1993). *The effects of anxiety on English learning of the senior high school students in Taiwan*. Master's Thesis, National Taiwan Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Yoon, K., Schmidt, F., & Ilies, R. (2002). Cross-cultural construct validity of the five-factor model of personality among Korean employees. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(3), 217-235.
- Young, D. J. (1986). The relationship between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency ratings. *Foreign Language Annals*, 19(5), 439-445.
- Young, D. J. (1990). An investigation of students' perspectives on anxiety and speaking. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23(6), 539-553.
- Young, D. J. (1991a). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest?. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(4), 426-439.

- Young, D. J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interviews with Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrell, and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25(2), 157-172.
- Yurtsever, Hidayet (2009). *Kişilik Özelliklerinin Stres Düzeyine Etkisi ve Stresle Başa Çıkma Yolları: Üniversite Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Master's Thesis, Dokuz Eylül University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, İzmir.
- Yürür, S. (2009). Yöneticilerin çatışma yönetim tarzları ve kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin analizine yönelik bir çalışma. *C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, Cilt 10, Sayı 1.
- Zaremba, A. J. (2006). *Organizational communication: Foundations for business & collaboration*. Mason, Ohio : Thomson/South-Western.
- Zhang, L. F. (2003). Does the Big Five predict learning approaches?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(8), 1431-1446.
- Zhang, Y. (2009). The role of personality in second language acquisition. *Asian Social Science*, 4(5), 58-59.
- Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative language learning and foreign language learning and teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 81-83.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 82-91.

APPENDICES



APPENDIX A. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Department:
2. Age:
3. Gender: W () M ()
4. How long have you been studying English?
5. Have you ever been in a country/countries where English is widely spoken?
Yes () No ()
If yes, which country/countries and for how long?
6. Type of high school from which you graduated:
7. Were you in a language group in high school?
8. Have you ever attended any English courses outside of your university during your university life?
If yes, which course(s) and for how long?
9. How do you evaluate your academic success during university?
a) low b) medium c) high
10. Are you satisfied to be studying in your current department?
Yes () No ()
11. Which of the following language skill is the most difficult for you?
Choose all that apply:
a) reading b) writing c) speaking d) listening e) grammar
12. At which of the following language skills do you feel you are strongest?
a) reading b) writing c) speaking d) listening e) grammar
13. Do you know any other foreign languages apart from English?
Yes () No ()
If yes, which language(s)?

APPENDIX B. ENGLISH SPEAKING SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

English Speaking Self-Efficacy Scale

The following statements are related to your perception about your English speaking self-efficacy in different situations. You need to indicate the strength of your agreement with each statement, according to the scale in which 1 means totally 'unable to do this', 7 means 'able to do this', and 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 represent intermediate judgments. There are not right or wrong answers, so circle the number which reflects you best for each statement.

		I am totally unable to do this	I am unable to do this	am possibly unable to do this	I am possibly able to do this	I am basically and in principle able to do this	I am able to do this	I am able to do this well
1	Can you describe your university to other people in English?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	Can you describe the way to the university from the place where you live in English?	1	2	3	4	5	4	5
3	Can you tell a story in English?	1	2	3	4	5	4	5
4	Can you ask your teacher questions in English?	1	2	3	4	5	4	5
5	Can you introduce your teacher (to someone else) in English?	1	2	3	4	5	4	5
6	Can you discuss subjects of general interest with your fellow students (in English)?	1	2	3	4	5	4	5
7	Can you answer your teacher's questions in English?	1	2	3	4	5	4	5
8	Can you introduce yourself in English?	1	2	3	4	5	4	5

APPENDIX C. FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM ANXIETY SCALE

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

The following statements are related to your perception about your speaking anxiety in different situations. You need to indicate the strength of your agreement with each statement, according to the scale in which 1 means strong disagreement, 5 means strong agreement, and 2, 3, and 4 represent intermediate judgments. There are not right or wrong answers, so circle the number which reflects you best for each statement.

	I see myself as someone who...	Disagree strongly	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree strongly
1	I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I don't worry about making mistakes in language class.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class.	1	2	3	4	5
4	It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the foreign language.	1	2	3	4	5
5	It wouldn't bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.	1	2	3	4	5
6	During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I keep thinking that the other students are better at languages than I am.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I am usually at ease during tests in my language class.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.	1	2	3	4	5

10	I worry about the consequences of failing my foreign language class.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I don't understand why some people get so upset over foreign language classes.	1	2	3	4	5
12	In language class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.	1	2	3	4	5
13	It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I would not be nervous speaking the foreign language with native speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Even if I am well prepared for language class, I feel anxious about it.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I often feel like not going to my language class.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in language class.	1	2	3	4	5
21	The more I study for a language test, the more confused I get.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for language class.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I always feel that the other students speak the foreign language better than I do.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I feel very self-conscious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students.	1	2	3	4	5
25	Language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.	1	2	3	4	5
26	I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than in my other classes.	1	2	3	4	5
27	I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.	1	2	3	4	5
28	When I'm on my way to language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.	1	2	3	4	5
29	I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says.	1	2	3	4	5
30	I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.	1	2	3	4	5
31	I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language.	1	2	3	4	5
32	I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of the foreign language.	1	2	3	4	5
33	I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D. THE BIG FIVE INVENTORY (BFI)

The Big Five Inventory (BFI)

The following statements are related to your perception about yourself in different situations. You need to indicate the strength of your agreement with each statement, according to the scale in which 1 means strong disagreement, 5 means strong agreement, and 2, 3, and 4 represent intermediate judgments. There are not right or wrong answers, so circle the number which reflects you best for each statement.

	I see myself as someone who...	Disagree strongly	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree strongly
1	Is talkative.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Tends to find fault in others	1	2	3	4	5
3	Does a thorough job.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Is depressed, blue	1	2	3	4	5
5	Is original, comes up with new ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Is reserved.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Is helpful and unselfish with others.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Can be somewhat careless.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Is relaxed, handles stress well.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Is curious about many different things.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Is full of energy	1	2	3	4	5
12	Starts quarrels with others	1	2	3	4	5
13	Is a reliable worker	1	2	3	4	5
14	Can be tense.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Is ingenious, a deep thinker.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Generates a lot of enthusiasm.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Has a forgiving nature.	1	2	3	4	5

18	Tends to be disorganized	1	2	3	4	5
19	Worries a lot	1	2	3	4	5
20	Has an active imagination.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Tends to be quiet.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Is generally trusting.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Tends to be lazy.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Is emotionally stable, not easily upset	1	2	3	4	5
25	Is inventive	1	2	3	4	5
26	Has an assertive personality	1	2	3	4	5
27	Can be cold and aloof	1	2	3	4	5
28	Perseveres until the task is finished	1	2	3	4	5
29	Can be moody	1	2	3	4	5
30	Values artistic, aesthetic experiences	1	2	3	4	5
31	Is sometimes shy, inhibited	1	2	3	4	5
32	Is considerate and kind to almost	1	2	3	4	5
33	Does things efficiently	1	2	3	4	5
34	Remains calm in tense situations	1	2	3	4	5
35	Prefers work that is routine	1	2	3	4	5
36	Is outgoing, sociable	1	2	3	4	5
37	Is sometimes rude to others.	1	2	3	4	5
38	Makes plans and follows through with	1	2	3	4	5
39	Gets nervous easily	1	2	3	4	5
40	Likes to reflect, play with ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
41	Has few artistic interests	1	2	3	4	5
42	Likes to cooperate with others	1	2	3	4	5
43	Is easily distracted	1	2	3	4	5
44	Is sophisticated in art, music, literature	1	2	3	4	5