English Language Anxiety and the Big Five Personality Factors

Youssef BABA KHOUYA
Ph.D. Student of Education
Department of Education
Inje University
Gimhae, South Korea

Abstract

This study aimed at examining the relationship between the Big-Five personality factors (BFBFs) and English language anxiety (ELA) following a multivariate approach. The participants were 345 university students (58% female and 42% male) from non-English majors. Canonical correlation indicated that Neuroticism was positively correlated whereas both Openness to Experience and Agreeableness were negatively correlated with Communication Apprehension and Anxiety of English Class. Extraversion was found to be positively correlated with Test Anxiety and Fear of Negative Evaluation. No correlation was found between Conscientiousness and ELA. In the light of these findings, some pertinent implications were provided.

Key-terms: Big-Five personality factors; foreign language anxiety; English language anxiety.

1. Introduction

The BFBFs are comprehensive and widely replicated trait taxonomy (Goldberg, 1993; McCrae & Costa, 2003). This personality taxonomy has dominated the field of personality psychology since 1980s. The labels given to those five traits still vary but they are often described as Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Each trait is composed of six facets. For example, Agreeableness facets are Trust, Morality, Altruism, Cooperation, Modesty, and Sympathy. Moreover, this model of personality was labeled the Big-Five (Goldberg, 1981) not to indicate their intrinsic greatness but to imply that each factor is largely broad. Hence, the Big-five does not suggest that personality differences can be classified to only five traits. Rather, personality is represented at the deepest level of abstraction by these five traits, and that each trait includes so many distinct and specific personality characteristics (John & Srivastava, 1999).

As for foreign language anxiety (FLA), which is English language in this study, it is a term that refers to "the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language [L2] contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning" (Mac Intyre & Gardner, 1994). It is also considered "complex, multidimensional phenomenon" (Koul, Kaewkuekool & Ploisawaschai, 2009). FLA was divided by Horwitz Horwitz, and Cope (1986) into three categories: Communication Apprehension, Test Anxiety, and Fear of negative evaluation. Communication Apprehension is "a type of shyness characterized by fear of or anxiety about communicating with people" (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). Individuals with the problem of speaking in public or in groups may have more difficulty speaking in a foreign language class where they cannot properly control a communicative situation. The second category is Test Anxiety and it means "a type of performance anxiety stemming from a fear of failure" (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). Individuals with Test Anxiety tend to have high worry about their performance and demand more of themselves than they are capable of. The last category is Fear of Negative Evaluation and it deals with "apprehension about others' evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively" (Watson& Friend, 1969, as cited in Horwitz et al., 1986). Students with this type of FLA rarely start a conversation and interact minimally (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002).

2. The Big-Five and academic achievement

Several variables are considered to influence and predict academic achievement. Intelligence, as an example, explains a large variance in academic achievement in comparison to the variance in personality such as the Big-Five (Di Fabio & Busoni, 2007).

Moreover, a considerable number of studies indicated that personality, IQ, and gender do predict academic achievement (Leeson, Chiarrochi& Heaven, 2008), mainly the personality factors which highly predict academic achievement when IQ is controlled for (Noftle& Robins, 2007). The following discussion mentions some of those studies that related personality factors to academic achievement.

First, those who are high on Openness to Experience are usually intellectually curious. This personality trait has been considered to be a reflection of the ideal student (De Raad, & Schouwenburg, 1996), due to its relationship with foresightedness and intelligence. Accordingly, "Openness is positively correlated with approach to learning (Vermetten et al., 2001), learning motivation (Tempelaaret al., 2007) and critical thinking (Bidjerano & Dai, 2007), but it also has the strongest negative correlation with absenteeism (Lounsbury, Steel, Loveland, & Gibson, 2003) of the Five Factor Model factors." (Kumari, 2014). Openness to Experience showed an association with academic achievement in school (Shuerger & Kuma, 1987) and at different university levels (De Fruyt & Mervielde, 1996; Hirschberg & Itkin, 1978). Some views suggested that this relationship was due to correlation between crystallized intelligence and Openness to Experience (Brand, 1994). More importantly, some researchers described this association in terms of typical performance (Goff & Ackerman, 1992), as other studies found a strong correlation between Openness and Typical Intellectual Engagement (Goff & Ackerman, 1992), the latter indicates doing much effort in intellectuality. Nevertheless, academic achievement has not always been predicted by Openness to Experience and Typical Intellectual Engagement (Busato et al., 2000; Wolfe & Johnson, 1995).

Second, Conscientiousness, which is related to will to achieve (Digman, 1989), is regarded as the personality factor that has the strongest correlation with academic achievement (Blickle, 1996; Busato et al., 2000; Costa & McCrae, 1992; Poropat, 2009;De Raad & Schouwenburg, 1996), even if IQ is controlled for. Furthermore, Conscientiousness showed relationship with sustained effort and goal setting (Barrick, Mount, & Strauss, 1993) which play a significant role in academic achievement (Steel,2007), in addition to compliance with and focus on homework (Trautwein, Ludtke, Schnyder, &Niggli, 2006), and time management and effort regulation (Bidjerano & Dai, 2007). A strong association was also found between this personality factor and academic achievement in school (Wolfe & Johnson, 1995), and different university levels (Chamorro Premuzic & Furnham, 2003a, 2003b; Goff & Ackerman, 1992; Hirschberg &Itkin, 1978). In particular, the Conscientiousness' facets demonstrate higher relationship with academic achievement than the factor itself (O'Connor & Paunonen, 2008).

Third, individuals with high level of Extraversion are known for drawing attention and being the life of a party. They usually seek stimulation and may be quickly and easily bored while studying. This may have a destructive impact on efficient study habits (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003a). Consistently with that, Extraversion showed negative correlation with academic achievement in several studies (O'Connor & Paunonen, 2007; DeYoung, 2010; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; Noftle& Robins, 2007;). New research has also concluded that individuals high on Extraversion tended to have low academic achievement as they were considered distracted, social, and impulsive (Sanchez-Marin, Rejano-Infante, & Rodriguez-Troyano, 2001).

Fourth, Agreeableness may have a positive contribution to academic achievement. This was indicated by a study which mentioned that this factor was associated with compliance with teacher instructions and concentration on learning (Vermetten, Lodewijks, &Vermunt, 2001). This means that those who are high on Agreeableness are generally good at academic adjustment as they can keep a positive relationship with their teachers and peers, and they usually show scholastic competence, behavioral conduct, and academic success (Hair & Graziano, 2003).

Finally, individuals with high level of Neuroticism are usually irritable and show weak impulse control. This usually has a negative impact on study habits (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003a). Besides, these people are usually represented as anxious and tend to pay more attention to their emotional state and self-talk which negatively affect their attention to academic work, and therefore, lower their academic performance (De Raad & Schouwenburg, 1996). In addition, stress and anxiety during tests (Zeidner & Matthews, 2000) are usually regarded as explanations for the negative association between Neuroticism and academic achievement. Nevertheless, this relationship between these two criteria is sometimes ambiguous. Simply put, Eysenck and Eysenck (1985) suggested that the motivational influence of anxiety, which is a main facet of Neuroticism, may be stronger in students with higher intelligence because they experience less difficulty while learning. In this context, Neuroticism is a positive predictor in smart learners and a negative predictor in less intelligent learners. On the whole, several results and studies ensure the relationship between the BFBFs and academic achievement.

The majority of these studies rely on the associations between these personality factors measures and other constructs which have been found to be correlated with academic achievement. However, these results cannot be considered conclusive as the associations found in these studies are not that strong to the extent that the corresponding Big-Five-academic achievement relationships can be formed.

3. *Sources of Foreign Language Anxiety*

Many studies have been done for the sake of detecting the sources of language anxiety. Horwitz et all. (1986) classified the sources of anxiety into tests, communication apprehension and negative evaluation. Nevertheless, other sources are factors associated with the learner, the instructor, and the institutional practices (Young, 1994), the learning context (Phillips, 1999), the mother tongue skills (Sparks & Ganschow, 1995), learning styles (Reid, 1995), cultural practices (Ohata, 2005), stage fright, the learner's personality, the teacher's methodology (Oxford, 1999; Price, 1991; Tse, 2000), and expectation of negative evaluation from others (Aydin, 2008; Kitano, 2001; Liu, 2006).

Young (1990), as an example, came up with several classroom activities to be anxiety provoking for students, namely spontaneous role play in front of the class, speaking in front of the classmates, oral presentations, delivering a prepared conversation in the class, and writing work on the board. Another example implies that the fear of making mistakes in front of others was considered the most anxiety-provoking for Chinese students living in New Zealand (Mak & White, 1996). Kitano (2001) stated that evaluation from people received more concern from Advanced Japanese learners of English language.

However, being aware of the sources of FLA can provide much information about the right way to handle it. It is also very helpful for teachers as it allows them to help and support their anxious students to be involved in speaking activities which can also result in reducing or stopping students' anxiety.

4. Effects of Foreign Language Anxiety on Academic Achievement

Researchers are highly concerned with the negative role that anxiety plays in academic achievement (MacIntyre, 1999). Five main categories of factors were described to have relationship with language anxiety, namely behavioral, cognitive, psycholinguistic, physical, and sociolinguistic. For example, behavioral factors may happen when student does not attend the class or come without preparation (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002). It was also stated that "language anxiety can have an effect on learners at different levels: the academic (Gardner, Smythe, &Lalonde, 1984), the affective (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a), the social (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991b; Young, 1999), and the personality related levels (Cheng, 2002; Cheng, Horwitz, &Schallert, 1999)" (Marcos-Llinas & Juan Garau, 2009). Generally, anxiety tends to reach the highest level in foreign language classes to the extent that some language learners may experience traumatic reactions such as attrition or leaving the major for another one (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1989), and also mental block (Bailey & Daley, 1999). Besides, it was pointed out that 50% of language learners encounter debilitating anxiety (Horwitz & Young, 1991), while others mentioned that anxiety can be facilitating as well (Spielmann & Radnofsky, 2001).

An extensive number of studies have considered language anxiety to be a predictor of foreign language achievement only when language variables are not used as predictors (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a, 1991b). Research has also discovered that anxiety show moderate negative association with language achievement scores which implies that students with higher anxiety anticipate or get lower grades compared to students with lower anxiety (Price, 1991; Trylong, 1987). There is a shared point between these studies which suggests that low-anxious learners will undoubtedly achieve better though another study concluded that there was no relationship between language anxiety and achievement (Bachman,1976). Additionally, much research has classified FLA to be among the strongest predictors of foreign language achievement (Aida, 1994; Gardner, 1985; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; Kim, 1998; Saito &Samimy, 1996).

5. The Big-Five and Foreign Language Anxiety

Despite the fact that personality is considered stable over time and cannot describe intrapersonal differences in FLA over time (MacIntyre, 2007), many personality dimensions have been found to be predictors of interpersonal difference in FLA. More precisely, the studies that were conducted on the relationship between the BFBFs and FLA have focused mainly on Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness.

Starting with Neuroticism which was found to be related to high level of FLA (Dewaele, 2013). An important association was also found between this factor and foreign language classroom anxiety (FLCA) in the second, the third, and the fourth languages of two groups of language learners (Dewaele, 2013). This implies that "more emotionally stable participants suffer less from FLCA, whereas high-Neuroticism participants report significantly higher levels of FLCA" (Dewaele, 2013). Notwithstanding, the relationship between Neuroticism and FLA is not wholly clear, and this was mentioned by MacIntyre and Charos (1996) who found no relationship between Neuroticism and FLA.

The second personality factor that showed association with FLA was Extraversion. High level of this factor was found to be related to lower FLA (MacIntyre &Charos, 1996). This backs up those findings which imply that individuals high on Extraversion tend to experience less anxiety because they have a feeling of comfort while communicating (Brown, Robson, & Rosenkja5, 2001). However, a moderate relationship was found between Extraversion and FLCA (Dewaele, 2013).

As for Conscientiousness, Gregersen and Horwitz (2002) stated that conscientious students had higher FLA than other students. Precisely, conscientious students who considered their performance insufficient in an interview, had higher FLA and experienced more stress concerning errors they made in the foreign language. Learners with higher anxiety usually want to achieve outstanding personal performance, this leads to fear of evaluation and procrastination.

6. The Current Study

The objective behind conducting this study is to explore the multivariate relationship between the BFBFs and ELA. Based on the conceptual meaning and facets of the Big-Five (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Goldberg et al., 2006), the numerous associations between the BFPFs and academic achievement (Child, 1964; Entwistle & Entwistle, 1970; Vermetten et al., 2001; Furnham & Medhurst, 1995; Zeidner& Matthews, 2000; Hair &Graziano, 2003; Costa and McCare, 1992; Poropat, 2009), and the negative correlation between FLAand academic achievement (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1989; Gardner, Smythe, &Lalonde, 1984), different hypotheses were generated for this research. It is also worth mentioning that in the six hypotheses, ELAis considered as a whole and not as separated factors.

First, individuals with high level of Neuroticism are usually irritable and show weak impulse control. This usually has negative impact on study habits (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003a). Besides, anxiety is one of the six facets of Neuroticism, it is defined as the level of free floating anxiety in individual (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Moreover, both Neuroticism (Furnham & Medhurst, 1995; Zeidner& Matthews, 2000) and FLA (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1989) showed negative correlation with academic achievement. Thus, Neuroticism will be positively correlated with ELA (Hypothesis 1).

Second, individuals with high level of Extraversion are known for drawing attention and being the life of a party. They usually seek stimulation and may be quickly and easily bored while studying. This may have a destructive impact on efficient study habits (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003a), leading to ELA. Furthermore, both Extraversion (Entwistle & Entwistle, 1970) and FLA (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1989) were found to be negatively correlated with academic achievement. Hence, Extraversion will be positively correlated with ELA (Hypothesis 2).

Third, those who are high on Openness to Experience are usually intellectually curious. This personality trait tends to reflect "the ideal student" due to its association with being foresightedly intelligent and resourceful (De Raad & Schouwenburg, 1996). It was also stated that Openness to Experience positively correlated with approach to learning (Vermetten et al., 2001), learning motivation (Tempelaar et al., 2007), but it also has the strongest negative correlation with absenteeism (Lounsbury et al., 2003) among the BFPFs. Accordingly, Openness to Experience will be negatively correlated with ELA (Hypothesis 3).

Fourth, those who are high on Agreeableness are generally good at academic adjustment as they can keep a positive relationship with their teachers and peers, they usually show scholastic competence, behavioral conduct, and academic success (Hair & Graziano, 2003). Additionally, FLA tends to be negatively correlated with academic achievement (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1989). Therefore, Agreeableness will be negatively correlated with ELA (Hypothesis 4).

Finally, individuals with high level in Conscientiousness are usually more organized, disciplined, and hardworking. Costa and McCare (1992) indicated that high Conscientiousness is related with academic and occupational achievement. Furthermore, a meta-analysis study found that Conscientiousness is a consistent positive predictor of academic achievement (Poropat, 2009) while FLA is negatively correlated with academic achievement. Consequently, Conscientiousness will negatively correlate with ELA (Hypothesis 5).

7. Method

7.1. Subjects

The participants of this research were 345 Moroccan university students (58% female and % 42% male) from non-English majors. Their age ranged from 17 to 22 years old. The reason behind choosing university students is due to their number of years they have spent in classes learning other subjects in general and English language in particular. This means that university students will give better and suitable responses concerning the problem of ELA.

7.2. Instruments

IPIP: this study adopted the 50-item version of the International Personality Item Pool Big-Five inventory (IPIP; Goldberg, 1999). This scale allots 10 items for each personality factor and are answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Very Inaccurate (1) to Very Accurate (5). Each of the personality domains has a score from 10 to 50. Items 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 26, 28, 30, 32, 36, 38, and 46 are inversely coded. IPIP reveals a strong Alpha Cronbach of .90. Because the participants in this study were not native speakers of English and came from non-English majors, IPIP was delivered to them in their mother languages (Arabic language). The Arabic IPIP was translated by the researcher and indicated a strong Alpha Cronbach of .88.

FLCAS: the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale is a scale that was developed by Horwitz et al. (1986) to measure the degree to which students feel anxious while learning a foreign language in the classroom. That is to say, the FLCAS was developed to be a standard measurement for assessing anxiety as a specific reaction to foreign language learning (Truitt, 1995). This scale is composed of 33 items that evaluate communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation associated with FLA. This means that the FLCAS is divided into three domains (subcategories) with each having its own questions. Communication Apprehension is called FLCAS1, Test Anxiety is called FLCAS2, and Fear of Negative Evaluation is called FLCAS3. The FLACS follows a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). The total score ranges from 33 to 165 points. That is to say, higher score means higher FLA and vice versa. Items 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22, 28, 32 are inversely coded. The internal consistency of this instrument is 0.93 based on Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Horwtiz et al. 1986). This scale has been used in many studies of foreign language learning anxiety and indicated highly reliable measure (Aida, 1994; Elkhafaifi, 2005; Horwitz et al., 1986; Kim, 2000; Kitano, 2001; Moghaddam, 2015; Price, 1991; Sus, 2002; Şener, 2015; Wang, 2010; Zhao, 2007).

A slight modification to FLCAS was made by the researcher by replacing the words 'language' and 'foreign language' with 'English language.' This is because ELA was assessed in particular and not foreign language in general. Thus, FLCAS was referred to as ELCAS (English Language Classroom Anxiety Scale). Moreover, as the participants of this study were Moroccans, the ELCAS was translated by the researcher and showed an Alpha Chronbach of .91.

7.3. Procedure

After the administration of the two scales, certain instructions on the objective of the study and on how to fill out the scales were indicated. The participants were told that there was no right or wrong answer, that their confidentiality would be kept secured, and that their answers would be used for the study only.

8. Results

Descriptive statistics of the BFPFs and ELA are introduced by Table1. A canonical correlation analysis was followed where the BFPFs are used as predictors of the four factors of ELA to gauge the multivariate shared association between the two variable elements. The analysis of data came up with five functions which had Rc2 of .295, .194, .085, .019, and .010.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of BFPFs Measures and ELA Measures.

Big-Five Factors	Personalit	M	SD	Cronbach's α
Neuroticism		26.22	6.62	.88
Extraversion		32.97	5.72	.82
Openness to experience		36.01	5.23	.92
Agreeableness		35.10	5.30	.88
Conscientiousness		33.51	5.62	.90
ELA Factors		**M**	**SD**	**Cronbach's α**
Fear of Anxiety		30.12	8.13	.89
Test anxiety		28.07	6.40	.87
Anxiety of English classroom		9.55	3.33	.92
Communication Apprehension		12.02	4.48	.87

The correlation matrix that provoked these five functions are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations of the BFPFs Factors and ELA Factors

	Big-Five Personality Factors				
ELA	Neuroticism	Extraversion	Openness	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness
Fear of negative evaluation	.28*	.19	-.13	.02	-.17
Test anxiety	.21	.15	-.11	-.09	-.21
Anxiety of English classroom	.27*	.15	-.14	-.15	-.25*
Communication apprehension	.23	.04	-.32**	-.26	-.17

*p <.05, **p<.01

The complete model in each function was found to be statistically significant using Wilks's λ=.511 criterion, F=1.81, p< .05. This analysis indicated that the r2type effect size showed .501, which means that the model explained an important portion, around 50%, of the variance shared between the two variable elements.

The hierarchal arrangement of the functions for statistical significance was examined through a dimension reduction analysis. As it is remarked, the whole model from Function 1 to Function 2 showed statistical significance. Nevertheless, statistical significance was found only in the first function whereas the other functions indicated no statistical significance. Considering the Rc2 effects of every function, it is obvious that only the first two functions that can be dealt with in this research as they reported 29.5% and 19.4% of shared variance respectively. The standardized canonical function coefficients and structure coefficients for Functions 1 and 2 are introduced by Table 3. It is worth mentioning that structure coefficient with a score higher than .45 are considered for interpretation (Sherry & Henson, 2005).

Table 3. Canonical Solution for BFPFs Predicting ELA

Factors	Function1			Function2		
	Coef	r_s	r_s^2	Coef	r_s	r_s^2
Neuroticism	-.415	-.631	.395	.740	.370	.136
Extraversion	-.231	.111	.010	.708	.491	.241
Openness to experience	.702	.805	.649	.277	.213	.044
Agreeableness	.351	.518	.270	.540	.379	.147
Conscientiousness	.054	.352	.124	-.330	-.355	.144
Adequacy (mean of r_s^2)			.290			.142
Redundancy (adequacy *R_c^2)			.086			.029
R_c^2			.295			.194
Fear of negative evaluation	.088	-.439	.193	.873	.845	.685
Test anxiety	-.095	-.385	.148	-.097	.565	.290
Anxiety of English class	-.403	-.499	.249	.829	.441	.195
Communication apprehension	-.228	-.680	.462	-.252	.050	.003
Adequacy (mean of r_s^2)			.263			.293
Redundancy (adequacy * R_c^2)			.087			.049

Coef = standardized canonical function coefficient; r_s= structure coefficient; r_s^2= squared structure coefficient; R_c^2 = squaredcanonical correlations. Structure coefficients (r_s) greater than .45 are underlined.

8.1. Function 1

According to the structure coefficients, the relevant predictor variables were Neuroticism, Openness to Experience, and Agreeableness while Communication Apprehension and Anxiety of English Class were the criterion variables found to be relevant. Positive correlations were found between Neuroticism and all criterion variables whereas both Openness to Experience and Agreeableness negatively correlated with both of the two criterion variables. The adequacy estimates reveal that 29% of the Big-Five set variance was found in the set's canonical composite and 26% of the ELAset variance was found in its composite. Besides, the redundancy estimates show that 8.6% of the total variance in the set of the BFPFs was explained by the linear combination of ELA elements while 8.7% of the ELA set variance was explained by a linear combination of the BFPFs set.

8.2. Function 2

The structure coefficient indicated that Extraversion was the only relevant predictor variable whereas the two relevant criterion variables were Test Anxiety and Fear of Negative Evaluation. Furthermore, there was a positive correlation between Extraversion and the two criterion variables. The adequacy estimates reveal that 14% of the Big-Five set variance was found in the set's canonical composite and 29% of the ELA set variance was found in its composite. Besides, the redundancy estimates show that 2.9% of the total variance in the set of the BFPFs was explained by the linear combination of ELA elements while 4.9% of the ELA set variance was explained by a linear combination of the BFPFs set.

9. Discussion

This study aimed at investigating the multivariate association between the BFPFs and ELA. Hypotheses 1 and 2 indicated that Neuroticism and Extraversion will have a positive correlation with ELA, whereas hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 indicated that Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness will have negative correlations with ELA. The findings confirmed hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 but refuted 5.

Neuroticism showed positive correlations with both Communication Apprehension and Anxiety of English Class. Learners with high scores on Neuroticism may avoid holding a conversation in the English language as they usually have extreme worry. As an example, these learners may consider themselves incompetent and below their peers in the English language. This usually stands as a serious obstacle for many learners which makes them believe that mastering this foreign language is a far reaching goal. Hence, they may consider that learning the English language is something to be avoided.

Extraversion was positively correlated with Test Anxiety and Fear of Negative Evaluation, which confirms Hypothesis 2. This results was similar to what Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnhams (2003b) mentioned in their study. They found that learners high on Extraversion tended to be more disadvantaged in written tests. Besides, this relationship exists also in spoken evaluations. This correlation may be also due to the potential for negative attention.

Hypothesis 3 was also supported as Openness to Experience showed negative correlations with Communication Apprehension and Anxiety of English Class. Students high in this personality factor tend to have more curiosity and interest to discover or learn new things including foreign languages. These students may consider English language a skill that is worth being learnt in order to explore the world and, therefore, broaden their experience. Accordingly, these students may feel less anxious when it comes to asking for help from their teachers or classmates. Surprisingly, this result is inconsistent with another study that referred to a negative correlation between Openness to Experience and FLA (Gargalianou et al., 2015). Nevertheless, more studies have to be conducted in order to clearly understand this ambiguous relationships between these two variables.

Agreeableness also showed negative correlations with Communication Apprehension and Anxiety of English Class. As it was anticipated, these students, who are known for experiencing more positive interactions, can keep and manage positive interpersonal relationships easily. Agreeable learners usually do not regard foreign languages to be an obstacle that stands against them in communicating either inside or outside the classroom. Therefore, they may look at English language as something important to be learnt.

Hypothesis 5 was the only one refuted in this study. Clearly, Conscientiousness was not found to be correlated with ELA. This finding is inconsistent with another study that indicated a positive relationship between this personality factor and FLA (Gargalianou, Muehlfeld, Urbig & Van Witteloostuijn, 2015). This may assume that these students might have the ability to avoid, but not reduce, ELA to score higher in tests and exams. Forthcoming studies have to investigate the predictive power of Conscientiousness on both foreign language and English language exams with controlling for ELA so as to give more explanation for the current study.

10. Practical Implications

The findings of this study imply some practical implications. It seems that learners with different personality traits tend to experience ELA differently. This requires teachers of English to adapt their teaching methods to this variety of students. Besides, it is highly important for both teachers and students to take measures to reduce anxiety levels, as this phenomenon became the strongest and negative predictor for students' achievement in foreign languages learning in particular and learning in general. Thus, setting clear and achieved goals, having a relaxing atmosphere inside the classroom, sharing learning experiences, giving more opportunities to students to practice the language, and so on, have been indicated to be efficient in alleviating anxiety (Anderson, 2003; Liu, 2006, 2007, 2009;Tsui, 1996).

11. Limitations of the Study

This study is not perfect and contains some limitations. First, it has to be taken into consideration that canonical correlation cannot afford causality. However, it is also possible that the Big-Five may provoke ELA rather than the way round. Precisely, some personality factors might lead individuals to experience ELA. Consequently, incoming studies can examine the causality of the Big-Five in ELA. Moreover, the sampled students were only restricted to only one Moroccan university following the convenience sampling, which means that this study cannot be generalized.

References

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, 155-68.

Anderson, N. (2003). Narrowing the gap between perceived and actual performance through learner training in self assessment. Paper presented at the First Conference of Asian TEFL, Busan, South Korea.

Aydin, S. (2008). An investigation on the language anxiety and fear of negative evaluation among Turkish EFL learners. Asian EFL Journal, 31, 421-444.

Bachman, N. (1976). Two measures of affective factors as they relate to progress in adult second-language learning. Working Papers in Bilingualism, 10, 100–122.

Bailey, P., Daley, C., &Onwuegbuzie, A. (1999). Foreign language anxiety and learning style. Foreign Language Annals, 32, 64–72.

Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K. & Strauss, J.P. (1993). Conscientiousness and performance of sales representatives: Test for the mediating effect of goal setting. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 715 722.

Blickle, G.(1996).Personality traits, learning strategies, and performance. European Journal of Psychology.10,337-352.

Brand, C. (1994). Open to experience-closed to intelligence: Why the Big Five are really the Comprehensive Six. European Journal of Personality, 8, 299–310.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T. and Furnham, A. (2003a). Personality Traits and Academic Examination Performance. European Journal of Personality, 17, 237-250.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., &Furnham, A. (2003b). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal university samples. Journal of Research in Personality, 37(4), 319–338.

Cheng, Y. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. Foreign Language Annals, 35, 647-656.

Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., &Schallert, D. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. Language Learning, 49, 417–446.

Child, D. (1964). The relationship between introversion-extraversion, neuroticism and performance in school examinations. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 34, 178-196.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., &Furnham, A. (2003a). Personality traits and academic examination performance. European Journal of Personality, 17(3), 237–250.

Costa, P.T.J. and McCrae, R.R. (1992) Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual. Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.

De Fruyt, F. &Mervielde, I. (1996). "Personality and interests as predictors of educational streaming and achievement." European Journal of Personality, 10, 405-425.

De Raad, B., &Schouwenburg, H. C. (1996). Personality in learning and education: A review. European Journal of Personality, 10, 303-336.

DeYoung, C. G. (2010). Personality neuroscience and the biology of traits. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4, 1165–1180

Dewaele, J.-M. (2013). The link between foreign language classroom anxiety and psychoticism, extraversion, and neuroticism among adult bi- and multilinguals. Modern Language Journal, 97(3), 670-684.

Elkhafaifi H (2005). Listening comprehension and anxiety in the Arabic language classroom. Modern Lang. J. 89:206-220.

Entwistle, N. &Entwistle, D. (1970). The relationship between personality study methods and academic performance. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 40, 1321143.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach. New York: Plenum.

Furnham, A., &Medhurst, S. (1995). Personality correlates of academic seminar behaviour: a study of four instruments. Personality and Individual Differences, 19, 197-220.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., &Lalonde, R. N. (1984). The nature and replicability of factors in second language acquisition. Research Bulletin No. 605, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Goff, M., & Ackerman, P.L. (1992). Personality–intelligence relations: Assessment of typical intellectual engagement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84, 537–553.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. American Psychologist, 48, 26–34.

Goldberg, L.R., Johnson, J.A., Eber, H.W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M.C., Cloninger, C.R. and Gough, H.G. (2006) The International Personality Item Pool and the Future of Public-Domain Personality Measures. Journal of Research in Personality, 40, 84-96.

Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. Modern Language Journal, 86, 562–570. doi:10.1111/1540-4781.00161

Hair, E., &Graziano, W. (2003). Self-esteem, personality and achievement in high school: A prospective longitudinal study in Texas. Journal of Personality, 71(5), 971–994

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. Modern Language Journal, 70(2), 125—132. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x

Horwitz, E. K., & Young, D. J. (Eds.). (1991). Language anxiety. From theory and research to classroom implications. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin& O. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.

Kim JH (2000). Foreign language listening anxiety: A study of Korean students learning English. PhD. Thesis. University of Texas, Austin.

Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese language classroom. Modern Lang. J. 85:549-566.

Koul, R., Roy. L., Kaewkuekool, S., &Ploisawaschai, S. (2009). Multiple goal orientations and foreign language anxiety. System, 37(4), 676-688.

Kumari, B. (2014). The correlation of Personality Traits and Academic performance: A review of literature. Journal Of Humanities And Social Science, 4, 15-18.

Liu, M. (2006). Anxiety in Chinese EFL students at different proficiency levels. System, 34, 301-316.

Liu, M. (2007). Anxiety in oral English classrooms: A case study in China. Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching, 3, 1, 119-137.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young (Ed.), Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guild to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere (pp. 24-45). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

MacIntyre, P.D. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language: Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. Modern Language Journal, 9(4), 564-576.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. Language Learning, 32, 251-275.

MacIntyre, P., & Gardner, R. (1991a). Investigating language class anxiety using the focused essay technique. Modern Language Journal, 75, 296–304.

MacIntyre, P., & Gardner, R. (1991b). Language anxiety: Its relationship to other anxieties and to processing in native and second language. Language Learning, 41, 513–534.

MacIntyre, P.D., &Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes and affect as predictors of second language communication. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 15, 3-26.

O'Connor, M. C., &Paunonen, S. V. (2007). Big Five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. Personality and Individual Differences, 43, 971–990.

Oxford, R. L. (1999). Anxiety and the language learner: New insights. In Arnold, J. (Ed.), Affect in language learning (pp. 58-67). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Price, M. L. (1991). The subjective experience of foreign language anxiety: Interviews with anxious students. In E. K. Horwitz & D. Young (Eds.), Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications (pp. 141–150). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Reid, J. (Ed.). (1995). Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

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, 239–251.

Sanchez-Marin, M., Rejano-Infante, E., & Rodriguez-Troyano, Y. (2001). Personality and academic productivity in the university student. Social Behavior and Personality, 29, 299–305.

Spielmann, G., &Radnofsky, M. (2001). Learning language under tension: New directions from a qualitative study. Modern Language Journal, 8, 259–278.

Steel, P., 2007. The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. Psychological Bulletin, 133(1), pp.65–94.

Vermetten, Y. J., Lodewijks, H. G., &Vermunt, J. D. (2001). The role of personality traits and goal orientations in strategy use. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26, 149-170.

Watson, D., & Friend R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 33, 448-57.

Young, D. J. (1994). New directions in language anxiety research. In C. A. Klee (Ed.), Faces in a crowd: The individual learner in multisection courses. Boston: Heinle and Heinle. pp. 3-46

Young, D. (1990). An investigation of students' perspectives on anxiety and speaking. Foreign Language Annals, 23, 539-553.

Zhao N (2007). A study of high school students' English learning anxiety. Asian EFL J. 9(3):22-34.