Predictors of L2 Willingness to Communicate in Saudi Context

Oun Almesaar[1]

[1] Taibah University, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Oun Almesaar, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia.

Received: August 10, 2023 Accepted: October 30, 2023 Online Published: November 24, 2023

doi:10.5430/wjel.v14n1p206 URL: https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n1p206

Abstract

L2 Willingness to Communicate (L2WTC) is an important precursor of L2 behavior and actual use of L2. Associations between L2WTC and other L2 concepts, such as foreign language anxiety and self-perceived L2 competence, have been studied for some time. L2 learning is likely associated with other, broader psychological concepts, such as personality, and it is the aim of this study to explore the associations between L2WTC, foreign language anxiety, self-perceived L2 competence, openness to experience and extraversion, in the Saudi context. Being the first study to explore these associations in this context, this study has the potential to contribute to understanding of relatively low English competence among Saudi students by seeking to understand predictors of L2WTC. After conducting factor analyses (principal axis factoring with direct oblimin) of raw scores, two separate multiple regression analyses were conducted, with L2WTC outside classroom (L2WTC-OC) and L2WTC inside classroom (L2WTC-IC) factors as dependent variables, and factors relating to foreign language anxiety, self-perceived L2 competence, extraversion, and openness to experience entered as predictors. The addition of openness to experience improved prediction of L2WTC-IC above and beyond other factors (R square change = .025; p=.001), while addiction of extraversion improved prediction of L2WTC-OC (R square change = .032; p=.025).

Keywords: L2 willingness to communicate, Saudi Arabia, openness to experience, extraversion, FLCAS

1. Introduction

This article explores the antecedents of L2 willingness to communicate (WTC) in the Saudi Arabian context. L2WTC is possibly influenced by both personality constructs, such as extraversion (Alemi et al., 2013; Elwood, 2011; Kim, 2004) and openness to experience (Piechurska-Kuciel, 2018), as well as more specific factors, such as foreign language anxiety and self-perceived L2 communication competence (Piechurska-Kuciel, 2018). MacIntyre et al. (1998) hypothesized that L2WTC has many antecedents which can be ordered in a pyramid, with broad personality factors at the bottom and foreign language anxiety and perceived competence closer to the top of the pyramid – L2WTC and L2 behavior. The purpose of this research is to explore the significance of such factors in predicting L2WTC in the Saudi context; more specifically, whether extraversion and openness to experience contribute to prediction of L2WTC above and beyond the contributions of foreign language anxiety and self-perceived L2 communication competence.

Saudi Arabia has experienced major societal changes in the last few decades. Educational changes have been very pronounced, with the English language being introduced to primary schools in Saudi Arabia in the early 2000s (Khawaji, 2023, p. 267). The English language is, in fact, the only foreign language currently taught in Saudi public schools. English proficiency is recognized in Saudi Arabia as a powerful economic and intellectual tool, and an important asset on the job market (Khawaji, 2023, p. 266). The new Vision 2030, an ambitious plan to reform Saudi Arabia, foresees important changes and improvements to mandatory English language curricula as a way to boost the competitiveness of Saudi students on the local and global job markets. Although the importance of the English language is recognized and significant investments have been made, English proficiency is still fairly low among Saudi students (Alrabai, 2016, p. 21; Alshammari, 2022, p. 129; Hamouda, 2013, p. 17). This is one of the reasons why it is essential to analyze the predictors of one of the most important L2 variables, L2WTC, in the Saudi context. Doing so can inform plans to reform implementation, helping improve overall English proficiency among Saudi students.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Importance of the Study and Research Gap

L2WTC has been investigated to a certain extent in Saudi Arabia. Mahdi (2014) employed L2WTC operationalization developed by McCroskey (1992), looking at four different situations (group discussions, speaking in meetings, interpersonal conversations and public speaking) with three types of interlocutors (friend, acquaintance, and stranger). Mahdi investigated the relationship between L2WTC and personality traits (2014, p. 22), but considered personality traits very broadly, finding simply that "personality traits strongly affect WTC". Therefore, there is little we can take from Mahdi's study (2014) due to its very broad formulation of personality traits.

Concepts used in the current study, such as foreign language anxiety, self-perceived English competence, L2WTC, and personality traits, have been employed in other studies including Saudi participants (Bensalem, 2018; Mahdi, 2014; Sadiq, 2017), but to our knowledge ours is the first Saudi study to systematically look at the relationship between foreign language anxiety, self-perceived L2 competence, personality

traits (openness to experience and extraversion) and L2WTC in the context of Saudi Arabia.

This paper also presents the testing of the first Arabic translations of English versions of L2WTC (Peng, 2015) and self-perceived L2 competence scales (Piechurska-Kuciel, 2018), providing potential new tools for researchers who want to address the subject of L2 acquisition in Arabic-speaking countries.

2.2 L2 WTC and Openness to Experience

Personality traits are understood as broad predispositions which combine with other important factors (e.g., situation) to determine our behavior. It is thus likely that some personality traits are related to a portion of human behavior which relates to learning and using a foreign language. We know that openness to experience, as defined within the Big Five, NEO-PI-R (McCrae, 1994), and HEXACO (Ashton & Lee, 2008) models, is related to a whole range of behaviors involving the acquisition and utilization of new information. For instance, openness to experience is related to phenomena such as curiosity and creativity (Ivcevic & Brackett, 2015).

It has been shown that openness to experience plays a role in students' motivation to learn a foreign language (Ghapanchi et al., 2011). More specifically, openness to experience is related to L2 proficiency, L2 learning experience, and ideal L2 self (Ghapanchi et al., 2011), which are, alongside ought-to L2 self, components of Dörnyei's L2 Motivational System (Dörnyei, 2009). As openness to experience is a broad personality trait with numerous contributions to human behavior, it is not surprising that it plays an important role in the sphere of human activity which involves the acquisition of a foreign language. In the light of the findings of Ghapanchi et al. (2011), we can state that openness to experience potentially increases opportunities to learn a foreign language, in turn facilitating good L2 proficiency and fostering a positive ideal L2 self. An important aspect of L2 learning experience can be related to situations of communicating in a foreign language on students' own initiative. One of the ways to formalize this is through the construct called 'willingness to communicate (WTC)' in a foreign language (MacIntyre et al., 1998; Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015; Shirvan et al., 2019).

WTC has been conceptualized and operationalized in many different ways (Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015; Yashima, 2002 p. 60). Initially, it was understood as a personality trait (McCroskey & Baer, 1985), comparable with the willingness to communicate in one's mother tongue. This construct is associated with introversion, perceived competence, and communication apprehension (Sallinen-Kuparinen et al., 1991). WTC was understood as a relatively stable trait, being manifested across various situations (i.e., talking to friends, acquaintances, or strangers). On the other hand, it also became evident that L2WTC was not simply an extension of L1WTC (MacIntyre et al., 1998). It was apparent, in fact, that L1 and L2WTC were not necessarily associated, and there is a study which pointed to a negative correlation between the two (MacIntyre et al., 1998 p. 546). Students who, in spite of high L2 competence, may not be willing to communicate in L2, do not necessarily exhibit the same behavior in an L1 context; moreover, there is probably a sizeable proportion of students who, though not well-versed in L2, are willing to communicate whenever given the opportunity to do so. It is thus important to make a distinction between the two constructs (L1WTC and L2WTC).

As already mentioned, MacIntyre and colleagues (1998) conceived of a pyramid suitable for systematizing the relations between proximal and distal causes of L2 communication behavior. They identified personality and intergroup climate as the underlying causes of communication behavior. L2 willingness to communicate, on the other hand, is the immediate cause behind actual communication behavior. L2WTC is the product of various factors such as personality, intergroup climate, intergroup attitudes, self-confidence, motivation, etc. (MacIntyre et al., 1998 p. 547). L2WTC was identified as an important determinant of frequency of L2 communication (Clément et al., 2003), while communication frequency was identified as a direct determinant of L2 proficiency (Taguchi et al., 2016). This makes L2WTC an important relay point in the chain of causes from broader indirect determinants, such as aptitude or personality, to L2 behavior and proficiency.

It has to be pointed out here that L2WTC can be conceptualized as encompassing two broad sets of situations for using a foreign language: inside the classroom (L2WTC-IC; IC standing for "inside classroom") and outside the classroom (L2WTC-OC; OC standing for "outside classroom") (MacIntyre et al., 2001; Peng, 2013; 2015). It has been found that L2WTC behavior can, indeed, be divided into these two separate components (Peng, 2015). On the other hand, some researchers have utilized L2WTC as a unitary concept (Yashima, 2002), possibly because L2WTC was developed with L1WTC in mind (McCroskey, 1992), for which, of course, the distinction between inside classroom and outside classroom is irrelevant. In this study, Peng's (2015) approach to assessing L2WTC was utilized, which makes a clear distinction between L2WTC-IC and L2WTC-OC.

There are many possible personality antecedents of L2WTC. Openness to experience is a good candidate in this respect; open-minded people are curious and love to learn new things. Openness to experience, for instance, is a predictor of performance in a "changing task context experiment" (LePine et al., 2000). The authors argue that openness to experience, by fostering adaptability, improves performance in the context of changing task (LePine et al., 2000). Indeed, the task of talking or simply using an L2 involves a certain degree of adaptability; one has to quickly "activate" a completely new cognitive set, and to adapt to a specific context (i.e., talking in class, talking to foreigners in informal situations, etc.). Moreover, openness to experience, generally speaking, involves willingness and eagerness to try out new things. People who have fairly low openness to experience prefer to remain within the boundaries of things they are familiar with, while more open-minded people love to experiment and try out new things, which might involve talking in a foreign language.

In addition, openness to experience has been found to be positively related to multicultural experiences (Sparkman et al., 2016). In other words, open-minded people may be more likely to be curious, among other things, about other people's cultures, with language, of course, being one of the most important aspects of any culture. Thus, it is not simply that open-minded people are likely to be able to adapt better to

the situation of talking in a foreign language, but more broadly, they are more likely to be generally curious about other cultures and, consequently, other languages. These are the main reasons why we can suppose that openness to experience is associated with L2WTC and, indeed, Piechurska-Kuciel (2018) determined that openness to experience predicts L2WTC, accounting for 21% of variability in L2WTC.

2.3 L2 WTC and Extraversion

The connection between extraversion and L2WTC is apparently much more straightforward, compared to the connection between openness to experience and L2WTC. However, when we look at available literature, we can see that there are conflicting results (Alemi et al., 2013; Kim, 2004), with some even pointing to a negative relationship between extraversion and L2WTC (Carluccio et al., 2019). Alemi et al. (2013), for instance, noted that due to particularities of their sample (who rarely had the opportunity to talk in L2), it was simply impossible to find any connection between extraversion and L2WTC. As far as the study of Carluccio et al. (2019) is concerned, the authors did not offer an explanation of the fact they found a negative relationship between extraversion and L2WTC. Moreover, it is not clear how Carluccio et al. (2019) assessed extraversion. It is possible that their method of assessing extraversion lacked reliability and validity; in addition, it is likely that the characteristics of the sample were such that they affected the relationship between extraversion and L2WTC.

It is rather likely that there is a positive relationship between extraversion and L2WTC, although this connection is not as straightforward as the connection between extraversion and L1WTC. Elwood (2011), in a detailed doctoral dissertation, focuses, among other things, on the connection between extraversion and L2WTC, and shows that extraversion is, indeed, an important personality-related determinant of L2WTC; in fact, the only important personality determinant. Elwood completed this study in Japan, with Japanese students as participants. It is possible that there is a cultural effect on the way extraversion is expressed, which means that we cannot simply generalize Elwood's findings to other cultures, such as the culture of Saudi Arabia, without testing. In a similar way, although Elwood (2011) did not find a relationship between openness to experience and L2WTC in Japan, this does not necessarily mean that this connection does not exist in Saudi Arabia. In Elwood's study (2011), L2 anxiety and perceived competence also figured as important factors, besides extraversion. Here, it has to be pointed out that Elwood (2011) used L2WTC as a unitary concept, without distinguishing between outside/inside-classroom aspects of this concept. It is our supposition that openness to experience and extraversion have the potential to explain both L2WTC-IC and L2WTC-OC; on a sidenote, L2WTC-OC has been left largely unexplained in Peng's (2015) SEM model, which included components of Dörnyei's (2009, 2019) L2 Motivational Self System (comprised of ideal L2 self; ought-to L2 self; L2 learning experience, and L2 anxiety), and it is possible that addition of personality traits can improve our ability to explain L2WTC-OC.

2.4 L2 Anxiety and Self-Perceived L2 Competence

Piechurska-Kuciel (2018) tested the predictive significance of L2 anxiety (Horwitz, 1986) and self-perceived L2 proficiency, which, alongside openness to experience, accounted for 45% of L2WTC variance in total. Briefly put, L2 anxiety is a trait-like construct, which relates to people's predisposition to react in an anxious way to L2 learning and utilization situations. L2 anxiety is related to low language achievement and has been found to be somewhat independent from other anxiety-related constructs, such as broad personality traits (Horwitz, 2001).

The construct of self-perceived L2 competence, in turn, has also been used by a number of researchers, in a variety of ways; some researchers focused on communicative competence (Dewaele, 2010), others even more specifically on pronunciation (Szyszka, 2011), and yet others more broadly on FL skills (Piechurska-Kuciel, 2011). For the purposes of this study, we opt for the broader approach taken by Piechurska-Kuciel (2011, 2018), according to which self-perceived competence is assessed across the main pillars of foreign language skills (speaking, listening, writing, and reading).

2.5 Research Questions

The aim of this study was to investigate whether the addition of openness to experience and extraversion contributes to prediction of L2WTC, in the Saudi context. The following research questions were central to the study:

1. What are the main factors underlying L2WTC in the Saudi context?
2. Do extraversion and openness to experience contribute to prediction of L2WTC over and above other predictors of L2WTC, such as foreign language anxiety and self-perceived L2 competence?

3. Method

3.1 Research Design

This is a correlational study investigating the effects of foreign language anxiety, self-perceived L2 competence, openness to experience and extraversion on L2WTC. Data for all variables was collected for each participant.

The study was based on the studies of Park (2014), Almesaar (2022) and Piechurska-Kuciel (2018). More specifically, Park (2014) and Almesaar (2022) tested the factor structure of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) (Horwitz, 1986), utilizing the maximum likelihood method of factor extraction, coupled with oblimin rotation. Whereas in Almesaar (2022) the authors chose to use the same method of factor extraction as Park (2014), in this study it was decided that principal axis factoring would be more appropriate due to concerns regarding deviations of data from multivariate normality, which is a prerequisite of maximum likelihood factor extraction. This factor analysis framework was applied on all scales used in this study.

While Park (2014) and Almesaar (2022) provided background for factor analysis in this study, Piechurska-Kuciel (2018) provided

background for the main analysis, which is the multiple regression of potential L2WTC predictors onto L2WTC. The contribution of the study presented in this paper is that, unlike Piechurska-Kuciel (2018), who entered raw scores in multiple regression, we decided to enter factor scores of all main variables.

3.2 Data Collection

3.2.1 Sampling

Saudi university students (studying in Saudi Arabia) who are attending English courses at their universities were recruited for this study. The questionnaires were completed online, via Survey Monkey. Sampling was convenient; more specifically, the author, being associated with a Saudi Arabian university, was able to access the students' social media groups and invite students to participate in the study.

3.2.2 Participants

A GPower analysis was conducted prior to determining the minimum required number of participants. The following parameters were set: two-tailed analysis, expected effect size of .15, alpha error .05, power .95. The GPower algorithm recommended a minimum sample size of 89.

The initial sample numbered 308 participants, and after removing participants who did not complete all questionnaires and participants with response sets (i.e., providing the same answer to all items), the final sample numbered 263 participants; there were no drastic outliers. On average, participants were 21.4 years old (SD=1.1 years), 52.1% male, and they all came from a single Saudi University, where they were studying business and accounting.

3.3 Ethical Considerations

Participation in the study was voluntary (participants were required to read and sign the informed consent agreement) and there was no compensation for participating. The study was approved by the research ethics committee prior to the initiation of data collection; no sensitive, insulting, or harmful topics were mentioned anywhere in the testing procedure, nor were participants exposed to harmful or unpleasant stimuli. Participation in the study was anonymous, meaning that personal information was kept separate from study data. Personal information (email addresses) was used purely for purposes of debriefing and sending follow-up information.

The study was deemed to be potentially beneficial to participants, knowing that Saudi Arabia has a chronic problem of underperformance by students in the field of foreign languages; moreover, the study could potentially provide them with a valuable perspective into some of the determinants of their willingness to use the English language, which in turn could help them improve their learning strategies. All participants received a concise debriefing concerning the aims of the study and the researcher's email was provided in case participants had any follow-up questions and concerns. Participants' email addresses were collected, and upon finalization of the study, all participants received a brief summary of results and what these results meant for them in the context of improving their English competence.

3.4 Procedure

Prior to starting the testing procedure, all participants read the informed consent form and instructions for the study. The questionnaires were administered online, via Survey Monkey. The order of questions was randomized for each participant. The whole testing procedure took around 20 minutes to complete.

3.5 Instruments

L2WTC. For the assessment of L2 willingness to communicate, a scale presented by Peng (2015) was used. This short scale has four items relating to L2WTC-OC (e.g., being willing to communicate "When you have a chance to talk in a small group of strangers"), and four items relating to L2WTC-IC ("When you are given a chance to talk freely in an English class"). All items employ a six-point Likert scale (with 1 = definitely not willing to, 6 = definitely willing, and without the neutral option). The items of this scale were translated from English to Arabic by the researcher, who completed the initial translation from English to Arabic, while an independent translator translated the initial Arabic version back to English, in order to assure consistent meanings across the two languages. Based on comparisons between the original and "back" English versions, final adjustments were made and included in the final Arabic version of the questionnaire. The final Arabic version of Peng's L2WTC was also slightly adjusted to better suit the context of Saudi Arabia. This translation method was mentioned by Behr (2018) as one of many translation methods for survey design, able to provide high-quality outcomes.

Foreign Language Anxiety (FLCAS). FLCAS (Horwitz, 1986) was used for assessment of foreign language anxiety. This questionnaire was translated from English to Arabic for the needs of a previous study completed by the researcher (Almesaar, 2022). This questionnaire employs a five-point Likert scale, (1-totally disagree: 5-totally agree).

Self-perceived L2 competence. Piechurska-Kuciel (2018) presented a six-point scale (1-unsatisfactory, 6-excellent) for assessment of self-perceived level of FL skills, in four separate domains (speaking, listening, writing, and reading). Piechurska-Kuciel (2018) reports a satisfying degree of reliability for this scale, α=.88. This short and simple questionnaire was also translated by the researcher from English to Arabic, employing the same process outlined above.

Openness to experience and extraversion. The validated Arabic versions of IPIP-BFM-50, Five Factor questionnaire (Almaghbashy, 2017; Zeinoun et al., 2017) were further adapted by the researcher to better fit the Saudi Arabian context. This questionnaire was developed initially in English by Goldberg (1992). All questionnaires (English and Arabic versions) can be found in Appendix B.

3.6 Limitations to the Study

3.6.1 Sampling

Convenience sampling was utilized in this study, meaning that the sample gathered is not representative of the general population of university students in Saudi Arabia. Trends detected in this study should be tested in future studies that would gather a more representative sample.

3.6.2 Analyses

The two analyses utilized in the study, factor analysis and multiple regression analysis, have their advantages but also their negative sides. There are many different ways to extract and rotate factors; in this study, as was argued before (3.1 Research design), principal axis with oblimin (oblique) rotation was utilized; it is likely, however, that the choice of extraction and rotation methods, as well as other confounding variables such as the number of inversely formulated items (Ibrahim, 2001; Zhang et al., 2016), affects the number and nature of extracted factors.

Next, multiple regression analysis is appropriate for testing associations between variables, but it is not appropriate for testing causation processes between variables. Thus, even when significant and strong associations are found, researchers have to be careful about not interpreting results of multiple regression analysis in causation terms.

Limitations to the study in light of the results obtained are elaborated on in Discussion.

4. Analysis and Results

Reliability statistics (Cronbach's alpha) for all scales used in the study can be found in Table 1:

Table 1. Reliability estimates for scales used in the study, along with the number of items for each scale.

	Openness	Extraversion	FLCAS	L2WTC	Competence
Cronbach's alpha	.651	.708	.941	.858	.800
N of items	10	10	33	8	4

Reliabilities are satisfactory for scales FLCAS, L2WTC, and competence, while reliabilities for openness and extraversion scales have acceptable but fairly low reliability. It is possible that this is due to the complex content of the items, combined with a somewhat lower number of items per subscale.

Descriptive statistics can be found in Table 2:

Table 2. Means, standard deviations, ranges, skewness, and kurtosis for five scales

	Openness	Extraversion	FLCAS	L2WTC	Competence
Mean	35.38	29.03	95.05	26.49	14.87
SD	5.78	6.86	24.58	9.69	4.88
Range	21-50	10-48	46-157	8-48	4-24
Skewness (SE)	-.170 (.150)	-.200 (.150)	.108 (.150)	.077 (.150)	-.271 (.150)
Kurtosis (SE)	-.331 (.299)	.223 (.299)	-.665 (.299)	-.630 (.299)	-.267 (.299)

To inspect the distributions of scales, we considered the skewness and kurtosis estimates, as well as frequency distribution diagrams and Kolmogorov-Smirnoff tests. KMS test statistics are statistically significant ($p<.01$) for openness to experience, extraversion, and competence, while KMS shows no significant deviations for FLCAS and L2WTC.

With the help of frequency diagrams, we can observe that openness to experience has a leptokurtic distribution, with higher frequencies of middle values than we would expect with a normal distribution. The same goes for the distribution of extraversion, which is somewhat leptokurtic. Competence also potentially has more middle values than would be expected with a normal distribution. In the case of this variable, there are also peculiar increases in the frequency of low and high scores (both positive and negative). FLCAS scores are "flatter" than expected, with high frequencies of values of more extreme values.

The results concerning the univariate normality of five main variables in our research, taken together, yield the following conclusion: there are significant, though not overly severe, deviations from univariate normality. Deviation from multivariate normality is also evident after inspecting a chi-square versus Mahalonobis distance plot, a way to visually test the hypothesis of multivariate normality (Nor, 2015). This informed our choice of factor extraction method.

For factor analyses of all scales, we employed the principal axis method, as it does not assume multivariate normality (Fabrigar et al., 1999, p. 277). We employed direct oblimin rotation, to allow association between factors, with factors having initial eigenvalues larger than one considered for retention in the final model. The delta parameter for direct oblimin rotation was kept at 0.

Extraversion items seem to converge towards a three-factor solution. Factor 1 ("Sociability and being the center of attention") accounts for 21.5% of variance, Factor 2 ("Sociability"), accounts for 8.4% of variance. Factor 3 ("Introversion") explains 5.2% of variance. In total, these three factors explain 35% of variance of the whole scale. Table 3 shows the structure matrix of the extraversion scale (for all structure matrices, loadings <.1 were suppressed; commonalities, as well as factor correlation matrices can be found in Appendix, Table A1 to A11).

Table 3. Structure matrix for extraversion scale

Item	Factor 1 (Sociability and being the center of attention)	Factor 2 (Sociability)	Factor 3 (Introversion)
7 "I have little to say."	.684	.228	-.210
5 "I am quiet around strangers."	.620	.292	-.219
3 "I am the life of the party."	.559		-.110
9 "I keep in the background."	.432	.392	
1 "I don't like to draw attention to myself."	.394	.134	-.156
4 "I start conversations."	.207	.669	-.253
8"I feel comfortable around people."	.141	.572	-.320
6"I don't talk a lot."	.257	.232	-.688
2"I don't mind being the center of attention."	.202	.252	-.480
10"I talk to a lot of different people at parties."	.251	.353	-.473

Description: Extraction method: Principal axis. Rotation: Direct Oblimin. Factors with initial eigenvalues > 1 were considered for retention

More ambiguous is the factor analysis of openness to experience scale (see Table 4). Factor 1 was dubbed "General openness to experience", accounting for 21.8% of variance. Factor 2 was very challenging to interpret, explaining 8.8% of variance. Namely, items 8 ("I use difficult words") and 1 ("I have a rich vocabulary") have the highest (negative) loadings on this factor and may imply their "linguistic closeness" nature (all inverse items were recoded before analysis). However, there is a high positive loading from item 6 ("I do not have a good imagination"), which is not something we would expect and complicates interpretation of this factor. It is similar with Factor 3 (Cognitive openness 2) explaining 5.3% of variance with high loadings from items 2 ("I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas") and 4 ("I am not interested in abstract ideas"), with a moderate negative loading from item 9 ("I spend time reflecting on things"), which is another unexpected finding. It was thus decided that only Factor 1 ("General openness to experience") should be included in multiple regression analysis.

Table 4. Structure matrix for the factor analysis of openness to experience scale

Item	Factor 1 (General openness to experience)	Factor 2	Factor 3
10 "I am full of ideas."	.727	-.222	
5 "I have excellent ideas."	.632	-.175	.164
3 "I have a vivid imagination."	.585		
7 "I am quick to understand things."	.536	-.242	.179
6 "I do not have a good imagination."	.461	.366	.386
9 "I spend time reflecting on things."	.439		-.286
8 "I use difficult words."	.188	-.679	
1 "I have a rich vocabulary."	.323	-.494	
2 "I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas."		-.138	.423
4 "I am not interested in abstract ideas."		.151	.384

Description: Extraction method: Principal axis. Rotation: Direct Oblimin. Factors with initial eigenvalues > 1 were considered for retention.

Now follows a discussion of factor analysis of FLCAS scores (see Table A5 in Appendix). The basis for this factor analysis (and other factor analyses) was Park's (2014) and our previous research (Almesaar, 2022). These studies informed our current analysis, first by providing us with an expected number of FLCAS factors to extract (three) and the expected nature of FLCAS factors. Three extracted factors with eigenvalues over one cover 48.9% of total variance: Factor 1 was by far the most significant, explaining 39.8% and Factor 2 explained 6% of variance. Factor 3 had uniform low negative loadings and considering that it covered only 3% of variance, it was decided that this factor should be excluded; Factor 2 of FLCAS was also discarded since it mainly had low loadings, though there were some high loadings from negatively formulated items (this will be elaborated on in Discussion), most of which were already accounted for by Factor 1.

Items relating to willingness to communicate inside the classroom clearly loaded Factor 1 (L2WTC-IC, 46% of total variance) and items relating to the outside-the-classroom scenario had high loadings on Factor 2 (L2WTC-OC, 14% of total variance) (see Table 5). The correlation between factors is fairly high (.493), and item number four ("Having a chance to talk in a small group of strangers") had high loadings on both factors, but it is still possible to make a distinction between L2WTC-IC and L2WTC-OC. This was an important conclusion as it led to conducting two multiple regression analyses, with two aspects of L2WTC as criteria.

Table 5. Structure matrix for L2WTC scores

Item	Factor 1 (L2WTC-IC)	Factor 2 (L2WTC-OC)
6 "Talking in front of the class in English."	.898	.386
7 "Having a group discussion in an English class."	.822	.432
5 "Given a chance to talk freely in an English class."	.808	.452
8 "Giving a presentation in English in front of a large group."	.682	.333
3 "Having a discussion in a small group of friends."	.457	.792

1 “Talking to a friend standing before you in a line.”	.358	.768
2 “Talking to an acquaintance standing before you in a line.”	.296	.746
4 “Having a chance to talk in a small group of strangers.”	.471	.570

Description: Extraction method: Principal axis factoring. Rotation: Direct Oblimin. Factors with initial eigenvalues > 1 were considered for retention

Factor analysis of self-perceived L2 competence resulted in a one-factor solution, which explained 50.2% of variance of this variable, all four items having high loadings (from .670 to .780).

Two multiple regression analyses with factor scores were performed. There were four steps to each and predictors were added in the following order:

1. FLCAS general factor

2. Self-perceived L2 competence general factor

3. Extraversion factors

4. Openness to experience general factor

Now follows a discussion of multiple regression analysis with L2WTC-IC (see Table 6 for model summary and Table 7 for ANOVA: regression coefficients can be found in Table A12 in Appendix). FLCAS and self-perceived L2 competence are both important and statistically significant predictors and remain so through to step four. It is evident that the addition of extraversion factors (step three) does not contribute significantly to prediction of inside-classroom L2WTC (R square change = .015; p=.106), while addition of openness to experience (step four) does (R square change = .025; p=.001). Considering other standardized regression coefficients of step four allows us to further inspect these relationships. Namely, in step four, FLCAS is the most important predictor (β=.466; p<.001), followed by openness to experience in general (β=.172; p=.001) and self-perceived L2 competence (β=.161; p=.006). Factor 2 extraversion (Sociability) is also a significant predictor in step four (β=.137; p=.025).

Table 6. Model summary, multiple regression in four steps with WTC-IC as criterion.

Model	R square	Adj. R square	Standard Err.	R square change	Sig. R change
1	.328	.325	.782	.328	<.001
2	.342	.337	.775	.014	.020
3	.357	.345	.771	.015	.106
4	.382	.368	.757	.025	.001

Description: Model 1: FLCAS; Model 2: FLCAS, self-perceived L2 competence; Model 3: FLCAS, self-perceived L2 competence, extraversion factors; Model 4: FLCAS, self-perceived L2 competence, extraversion factors, openness to experience factors

Table 7. ANOVA for multiple regression, WTC-IC as criterion

Model	F	Sig.
1	127.258	<.001
2	67.492	<.001
3	28.561	<.001
4	26.390	<.001

We will now turn to L2WTC-OC (see Table 8 for model summary and Table 9 for ANOVA; regression coefficients can be found in Table A13 in Appendix). Self-perceived L2 competence is a significant predictor throughout all steps, while FLCAS stops being relevant with the introduction of other predictors (steps two to four). The addition of extraversion factors contributes to the prediction of the criterion variable (R square change = .032; p=.025), while this is not the case for openness to experience (R square change = .007; p=.149). Self-perceived L2 competence here figures as the most powerful predictor by step four (β=.200; p=.003) and is, in fact, the only statistically significant predictor by step four (none of the extraversion factors on their own is significant, although their joint addition slightly and significantly increases R), though the FLCAS factor is close to statistical significance (β=.131; p=.056).

Table 8. Model summary, multiple regression in four steps with WTC-OC as criterion

Step	R square	Adj. R square	Standard Err.	R square change	Sig. R change
1	.072	.068	.883	.072	<.001
2	.100	.093	.871	.028	.005
3	.132	.115	.860	.032	.025
4	.139	.119	.859	.007	.149

Table 9. ANOVA for multiple regression, WTC-OC as criterion

Model	F	Sig.
1	20.208	<.001
2	14.410	<.001
3	7.800	<.001
4	6.876	<.001

In the first multiple regression analysis, with WTC-IC as criterion, adjusted R square (.368) was significantly higher in comparison with

multiple regression with WTC-OC as criterion (adj. R square = .119). The explanatory power of our predictors thus decreases as we move them to the outside-classroom context.

5. Discussion

The first research question concerned the factor structure of L2WTC, and it was found that a two-factor structure, with L2WTC-IC and L2WTC-OC best described the variability of L2WTC in this study. It was also shown that the addition of openness to experience and extraversion contributed to the prediction of L2WTC-IC, while the addition of extraversion contributed to the prediction of L2WTC-OC. This answers the second research question regarding the contribution of extraversion and openness to experience to prediction of L2WTC, and in fact these results provide a more nuanced perspective. Openness to experience is thus relevant in the L2WTC-IC context, while extraversion is more important in the outside-the-classroom setting, although as we have seen, extraversion Factor 2 identified in this study as "Sociability", is also significant in predicting L2WTC-IC. It is evident, however, that the relative contribution of both personality traits is slight, with FLCAS being the most important predictor of L2WTC-IC and self-perceived L2 competence the most important predictor of L2WTC-OC. This finding stands in contrast to those of Piechurska-Kuciel (2018) who found that openness to experience predicted more than 20% of variance of L2WTC.

It was also found that self-perceived L2 is positively associated with L2WTC. There is a positive relationship between FLCAS and both aspects of L2WTC, while FLCAS only contributes significantly to prediction of L2WTC-IC. This (positive association between FLCAS and L2WTC-IC) is perhaps the most perplexing result and a challenging one to explain. It is possible that the specific cultural context of our research (Saudi Arabia) affected the connection between FLCAS and L2WTC-IC. Possibly, the items related to foreign language anxiety were interpreted in a more positive way by our participants, with high anxiety signifying high motivation in a language class, while low anxiety would signify a more nonchalant, careless attitude towards learning. Thus FLCAS, in this study at least, might have figured as an amalgam of L2 anxiety and L2 motivation. Further research, with a focus on qualitative methodologies and subjective experience of FLCAS items, would be needed to test this interpretation.

L2WTC-OC remains largely unexplained by our predictors in comparison to L2WTC-IC. This is further evidence in favor of making a distinction between L2WTC-IC and L2WTC-OC, and furthers the works of other researchers who also distinguished between the two (Denies et al., 2015; MacIntyre et al., 2001; Peng, 2013; 2015). Though the two aspects of L2WTC are connected, as implied by a moderate correlation between L2WTC-IC and L2WTC-OC factors in this study (.493), it seems that the factors that account well for variability in L2WTC-IC (FLCAS and self-perceived competence) are less important for predicting L2WTC-OC. It should be emphasized that self-perceived L2 competence was by far the most important predictor of L2WTC-OC, and similar results were obtained by other authors (e.g., Denies et al., 2015, p. 730). Future studies should further research the effects of related factors on L2WTC-OC (e.g., objective competence as determined via an achievement test; academic achievement) and there are findings pointing to a possibility that objective academic achievement is related to L2WTC (Oz, 2014). Moreover, although FLCAS did not predict L2WTC-OC, it is still likely that other anxiety-related concepts, such as neuroticism, can at least partially explain L2WTC-OC, based on the findings of Piechurska-Kuciel et al., (2021), and the same is true for L2WTC-IC. We believe it is important to attempt to investigate connections between L2 concepts and broader concepts coming from the field of personality psychology; more specifically, although specific L2 concepts (e.g., L2 anxiety, perceived competence) can be regarded as direct precursors of relevant L2 behavior (e.g., WTC), we should seek to understand the immediate precursors by putting them in a more general context of, for instance, broad personality traits. This was suggested by MacIntyre et al. (1998, p. 547), who proposed a pyramid model of L2 communication behavior, with L2 use and other L2-specific concepts at the "top" and broader concepts such as personality at the "bottom" of the pyramid.

There are a number of limitations to this study. Normal distribution of variables was identified as a potential issue. KMS tests showed significant deviations from normality for extraversion, openness to experience, and competence. Frequency diagrams for these variables showed slightly leptokurtic distributions, though with a general tendency towards normality. Although KMS tests for L2WTC and FLAS were not significant, we could still observe a deviation from the normal distribution towards a somewhat platykurtic distribution. Deviation from multivariate normality was also observed. The deviations were not considered significant enough to question the use of multiple regression (SPSS performs linear regression via least squares optimization), as it has been argued that linear regression is fairly robust to deviations from both univariate and multivariate normality (Knief & Forstmeier, 2021). The inspection of univariate and multivariate normality did inform our factor analysis, advising us to move away from maximum likelihood factor extraction method, which was employed in studies by Park (2014) and Almesaar (2022), and to use principal axis factoring which is more appropriate in datasets that deviate from multivariate normality (Fabrigar et al., 1999, p. 277).

Factor analyses of openness to experience and FLCAS items yielded ambiguous factor solutions that were challenging to interpret. In the case of openness to experience, we first have to mention the potential effect of low scale reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .651 and how this may have affected the true variance of the scale, and thus extraction of factors. Besides Factor 1, dubbed "general openness to experience", which had high loadings from most items, two other factors were extracted. Factor 2 only had high loadings (see Table 4) from inverse items, one of which was positive ("I do not have a good imagination") and the other two negative ("I have a rich vocabulary" and "I use difficult words"), and the situation was similar with Factor 3 of openness to experience. Factor 2 of FLCAS was also mainly loaded by inverse items. Researchers have pointed out the potential problems of negative (inverse) items for factor analysis and extraction of factors accounting mainly for inverse items (Ibrahim, 2001; Zhang et al., 2016). There are no straightforward explanations for this well-established phenomenon: Ibrahim (2001, p. 499) mentions the greater cognitive demand of negative items, low reading skills, and

participant response sets, while it is also possible that such factors are pure method artifacts, so-called "method factors" (Zhang et al., 2016, p. 2). Our interpretation was that the problematic factors identified in our analysis were mainly method artifacts, which is why we decided to exclude them from further analyses.

Another thing that should be kept in mind is the use of convenience sampling in this study. Students who participated in this study likely are not a perfect representation of all Saudi students, and the results obtained should be tested across other Saudi universities and include numerous types of studies.

In spite of these limitations, we believe that our study has contributed, in a general way, to the goal of establishing a connection between L2-specific concepts and broader "bottom" factors such as personality traits. This study also makes a specific contribution, relating to improving the state of research of L2 in Saudi Arabia (Bensalem, 2018; Mahdi, 2014; Sadiq, 2017) and identifying and overcoming challenges (e.g., the positive connection between FLCAS and L2WTC-IC found in this study) related to the application of L2 concepts in Saudi Arabia. Finally, this approach can inform future initiatives aimed at improving English language proficiency among Saudi students, by helping us identify relevant factors that may affect L2WTC and other important L2 phenomena.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable

Authors contributions

Not applicable

Funding

Not applicable

Competing interests

The author declares that he has no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have

appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are

not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

References

Alemi, M., Tajeddin, Z., & Mesbah, Z. (2013). Willingness to communicate in L2 English: Impact of learner variables. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 42-61. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260392878_Willingness_to_Communicate_in_L2_English_Impact_of_Learner_Variables

Almaghbashy, M. (2017). *Translation and Adaptation of Goldbergs IPIP-BFM-50 Scale of personality and Its Psychometric Properties among Sanaa University Students.* [Master's thesis. Faculty of Education, Sanaa University.] Retrieved from https://ipip.ori.org/ArabicBigFiveFactorMarkers.htm

Almesaar, O. (2022). English language anxiety and language achievement among EFL students in Saudi Arabia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 12*(11), 2253-2262. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1211.04

Alrabai, F. (2016). Factors underlying low achievement of Saudi EFL learners. *Int. J. Engl. Linguist., 6*(3), 21-37. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n3p21

Alshammari, H. A. (2022). Investigating the Low English Proficiency of Saudi EFL Learners. *Arab World Engl. J, 13*(1), 129-144. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no1.9

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008). The HEXACO model of personality structure and the importance of the H factor. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*(5), 1952-1962. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00134.x

Behr, D. (2018). Translating questionnaires for cross-national surveys: A description of a genre and its particularities based on the ISO 17100 categorization of translator competences. *Translation & Interpreting, 10*(2), 5-20. https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.110202.2018.a02

Bensalem, E. (2018). Foreign language anxiety of EFL students: Examining the effect of self-efficacy, self-perceived proficiency and sociobiographical variables. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 9*(2), 38-55. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no2.3

Carluccio, A., Rubakova, I., & Chetkina, A. (2019). *Extraversion, Motivation and Russian L2.* In SHS Web of Conferences 69, 1-6 . EDP Sciences. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20196900027

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. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X03022002003

Denies, K., Yashima, T., & Janssen, R. (2015). Classroom versus societal willingness to communicate: Investigating French as a second language in Flanders. *The Modern Language Journal, 99*(4), 718-739. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12276

Dewaele, J. M. (2010). Multilingualism and affordances: variation in self-perceived communicative competence and communicative anxiety in French L1, L2, L3 and L4. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 48*(2-3), 105-129. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2010.006

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). 2. The L2 Motivational Self System. In Z. Dörnyei and E. Ushioda, (eds.) *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp. 9-42). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-003

Dörnyei, Z. (2019). Towards a better understanding of the L2 Learning Experience, the Cinderella of the L2 Motivational Self System. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 9*(1), 19-30. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.2

Elwood, J. A. (2011). Enriching structural models of L2 willingness to communicate: The role of personality, ego permeability, and perceived distance. [Doctoral dissertation, Temple University]. Retrieved from https://scholarshare.temple.edu/bitstream/handle/20.500.12613/1167/Elwood_temple_0225E_10736.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*(3), 272-299. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272

Ghapanchi, Z., Khajavy, G. H., & Asadpour, S. F. (2011). L2 motivation and personality as predictors of the Second language proficiency: Role of the Big Five traits and L2 motivational self System. *Canadian Social Science, 7*(6), 148-155. https://doi.org/10.3968/j.css.1923669720110706.030

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4*, 26-42. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.26

Hamouda, A. (2013). An exploration of causes of Saudi students' reluctance to participate in the English language classroom. *Int. J. Lang. Educ. 1*(1), 17-34. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v1i1.2652

Horwitz, E. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 21,* 112-126. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000071

Horwitz, E. K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *Tesol Quarterly, 20*(3), 559-562. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586302

Ibrahim, A. M. (2001). Differential responding to positive and negative items: The case of a negative item in a questionnaire for course and faculty evaluation. *Psychological Reports, 88*(2), 497-500. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2001.88.2.497

Ivcevic, Z., & Brackett, M. A. (2015). Predicting creativity: Interactive effects of openness to experience and emotion regulation ability. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 9*(4), 480-487. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039826

Khawaji, A. (2023). Transition of English Language Teaching in Saudi Arabia: A Critical Evaluative Study. *Arab World Engl. J., 13*(4). 265-280. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no4.17

Kim, S. J. (2004). Exploring willingness to communicate (WTC) in English among Korean EFL (English as a foreign language) students in Korea: WTC as a predictor of success in second language acquisition. [Doctoral Dissertation. The Ohio State University.] Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_etd/send_file/send?accession=osu1101267838&disposition=inline

Knief, U., & Forstmeier, W. (2021) Violating the normality assumption may be the lesser of two evils. *Behav Res, 53*, 2576-2590. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01587-5

LePine, J. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Erez, A. (2000). Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel psychology, 53*(3), 563-593. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb00214.x

MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support, and language-learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in second language acquisition, 23*(3), 369-388. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263101003035

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & 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. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x

Mahdi, D. A. (2014). Willingness to Communicate in English: A Case Study of EFL Students at King Khalid University. *English Language Teaching, 7*(7), 17-25. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n7p17

McCrae, R. R. (1994). Openness to experience: Expanding the boundaries of Factor V. *European Journal of Personality, 8*, 251-272. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2410080404

McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly, 40*(1), 16-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369817

McCroskey, J. C., & Baer, J. E. (1985). Willingness to Communicate: The construct and its measurement. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO. Retrieved October 29, 2022, from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED265604.pdf

Nor, A. W. (2015). The graphical assessment of multivariate normality using SPSS. *Education in Medicine Journal, 7*(2), 71-75, https://doi.org/10.5959/eimj.v7i2.361

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), 1473-1482. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.9.1473

Park, G. P. (2014). Factor analysis of the foreign language classroom anxiety scale in Korean learners of English as a foreign language. *Psychological Reports, 115*(1), 261-275. https://doi.org/10.2466/28.11.PR0.115c10z2

Pawlak, M., & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A. (2015). Investigating the dynamic nature of L2 willingness to communicate. *System, 50*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.02.001

Peng, J. (2013). The challenge of measuring willingness to communicate in EFL contexts. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 22*(3), 281-290. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-012-0053-x

Peng, J. E. (2015). L2 motivational self system, attitudes, and affect as predictors of L2 WTC: An imagined community perspective. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 24*(2), 433-443. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-014-0195-0

Piechurska-Kuciel, E. (2011). Willingness to communicate in L2 and self-perceived levels of FL skills in Polish adolescents. In J. Arabski and A. Wojtaszek (Eds.), *Aspects of culture in second language acquisition and foreign language learning* (pp. 235-250). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20201-8_17

Piechurska-Kuciel, E. (2018). Openness to experience as a predictor of L2 WTC. *System, 72*, 190-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.01.001

Piechurska-Kuciel, E., Ożańska-Ponikwia, K., & Skałacka, K. (2021). Can the neuroticism-willingness to communicate relationship across languages be explained by anxiety? *Moderna Sprak, 115*(4), 176-199. https://doi.org/10.58221/mosp.v115i4.6784

Sadiq, J. M. (2017). Anxiety in English Language Learning: A Case Study of English Language Learners in Saudi Arabia. *English Language Teaching, 10*(7), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n7p1

Sallinen-Kuparinen, A., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1991). Willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, introversion and self-reported communication competence, Finnish and American comparisons. *Communication Research Reports, 8*(1), 55-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099109359876

Shirvan, E. M., Khajavy, G. H., MacIntyre, P. D., & Taherian, T. (2019). A meta-analysis of L2 willingness to communicate and its three high-evidence correlates. *Journal of psycholinguistic research, 48*(6), 1241-1267. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-019-09656-9

Sparkman, D. J., Eidelman, S., & Blanchar, J. C. (2016). Multicultural experiences reduce prejudice through personality shifts in Openness to Experience. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 46*(7), 840-853. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2189

Szyszka, M. (2011). Foreign language anxiety and self-perceived English pronunciation competence. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(2), 283-300. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2011.1.2.7

Taguchi, N., Xiao, F., & Li, S. (2016). Assessment of study abroad outcomes in Chinese as a second language: gains in cross-cultural adaptability, language contact and proficiency. *Intercultural Education, 27*(6), 600-614. https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2016.1217126

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(1),

54-66. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00136

Zeinoun, P., Daouk-Öyry, L., Choueiri, L., & Van de Vijver, F. J. (2017). A mixed-methods study of personality conceptions in the Levant: Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and the West Bank. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(3), 453-465. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000148.supp

Zhang, X., Noor, R., & Savalei, V. (2016). Examining the effect of reverse worded items on the factor structure of the need for cognition scale. *PLOS ONE, 11*(6), e0157795. 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0157795

Appendix A (Factor analysis and regression analysis tables)

Table A1. Communalities for extraversion factor analysis

Item	Initial	Extraction
1 “I don’t like to draw attention to myself.”	.144	.160
2 “I don’t mind being the center of attention.”	.186	.249
3 “I am the life of the party.”	.241	.325
4 “I start conversations.”	.235	.452
5 “I am quiet around strangers.”	.282	.397
6 “I don’t talk a lot.”	.243	.485
7 “I have little to say.”	.338	.471
8 “I feel comfortable around people.”	.220	.358
9 “I keep in the background.”	.182	.324
10 “I talk to a lot of different people at parties.”	.243	.282

Table A2. Extraversion factors intercorrelations

Factor	1	2	3
1	1.000	.326	-.221
2	.326	1.000	-.291
3	-.221	-.291	1.000

Table A3. Communalities for openness to experience factor analysis

Item	Initial	Extraction
1 “I have a rich vocabulary.”	.241	.309
2 “I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.”	.095	.202
3 “I have a vivid imagination.”	.330	.342
4 “I am not interested in abstract ideas.”	.087	.169
5 “I have excellent ideas.”	.353	.416
6 “I do not have a good imagination.”	.288	.501
7 “I am quick to understand things.”	.272	.330
8 “I use difficult words.”	.242	.472
9 “I spend time reflecting on things.”	.172	.310
10 “I am full of ideas.”	.410	.544

Table A4. Openness to experience factors intercorrelations

Factor	1	2	3
1	1.000	-.143	.118
2	-.143	1.000	.032
3	.118	.032	1.000

Table A5. Structure matrix for FLCAS factor analysis

Item	1	2	3
20 “I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in language class.”	.846	.329	.495
24 “I feel very self-conscious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students.”	.835	.317	.472
27 “I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.”	.830	.412	.537
3 “I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class.”	.778	.311	.478
13 “It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class.”	.774	.207	.420
31 “I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language.”	.771	.285	.409
9 “I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.”	.741	.378	.577
12 “In language class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.”	.694	.321	.557
1 “I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class.”	.669	.378	.449
16 “Even if I am well prepared for language class, I feel anxious about it.”	.663	.343	.628
19 “I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.”	.644	.155	.397
26 “I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than in my other classes.”	.612	.250	.531
2 “I don't worry about making mistakes in language class.”	.456	.343	.194
28 “When I'm on my way to language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.”	.437	.757	.369
18 “I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class.”	.514	.663	.344
14 “I would not be nervous speaking the foreign language with native speakers.”	.396	.650	.359

32 “I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of the foreign language.”	.222	.621	.216
22 “I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for language class.”	.327	.614	.242
8 “I am usually at ease during tests in my language class.”		.388	.282
29 “I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says.”	.590	.240	.747
4 “It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the foreign language.”	.653	.282	.719
15“I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.”	.418	.183	.684
33“I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.”	.615	.364	.638
10“I worry about the consequences of failing my foreign language class.”	.419	.352	.617
30“I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.”	.413	.287	.578
5“It wouldn't bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.”	.113	.308	.160
17“I often feel like not going to my language class.”	.526	.283	.384
11“I don't understand why some people get so upset over foreign language classes.”	.139	.414	.103
23“I always feel that the other students speak the foreign language better than I do.”	.554	.260	.516
7 “I keep thinking that the other students are better at languages than I am.”	.636	.299	.476
25“Language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.”	.411		.437
6“During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.”	.451	.182	.329
21“The more I study for a language test, the more con- fused I get.”	.530	.233	.471

Descriptions: Extraction method: Principal axis factoring. Rotation: Direct Oblimin. Factors with initial eigenvalues > 1 were considered for retention.

Table A6. Communalities for FLCAS factor analysis

Item	Initial	Extraction
FLCAS1	.595	.602
FLCAS2_neg	.336	.282
FLCAS3	.663	.621
FLCAS4	.651	.639
FLCAS5_neg	.353	.469
FLCAS6	.449	.454
FLCAS7	.708	.699
FLCAS8_neg	.260	.230
FLCAS9	.636	.615
FLCAS10	.437	.424
FLCAS11_neg	.273	.277
FLCAS12	.630	.601
FLCAS13	.626	.619
FLCAS14_neg	.487	.491
FLCAS15	.474	.508
FLCAS16	.598	.582
FLCAS17	.518	.540
FLCAS18_neg	.608	.591
FLCAS19	.528	.477
FLCAS20	.735	.751
FLCAS21	.539	.572
FLCAS22_neg	.445	.485
FLCAS23	.730	.796
FLCAS24	.760	.745
FLCAS25	.467	.469
FLCAS26	.589	.572
FLCAS27	.785	.759
FLCAS28_neg	.576	.645
FLCAS29	.607	.638
FLCAS30	.443	.436
FLCAS31	.631	.605
FLCAS32_neg	.401	.398
FLCAS33	.560	.549

Table A7. Factor intercorrelation for FLCAS

Factor	1	2	3
1	1.000	.348	.512
2	.348	1.000	.316
3	.512	.316	1.000

Table A8. L2WTC communalities for factor analysis

Item	Initial	Extraction
L2WTC_1_OC	.488	.590
L2WTC_2_OC	.456	.564
L2WTC_3_OC	.540	.633
L2WTC_4_OC	.372	.372
L2WTC_5_IC	.632	.657
L2WTC_6_IC	.683	.811
L2WTC_7_IC	.593	.676
L2WTC_8_IC	.444	.465

Table A9. Factor intercorrelation for L2WTC

Factor	1	2
1	1.000	.493
2	.493	1.000

Table A10. Communalities for self-perceived L2 competence factor analysis

Item	Initial	Extraction
Speaking	.355	.461
Listening	.350	.449
Writing	.385	.490
Reading	.448	.609

Table A11. Factor matrix for self-perceived L2 competence

Item	Factor 1
Reading	.780
Writing	.700
Speaking	.679
Listening	.670

Table A12. Regression coefficients: multiple regression for L2WTC-IC

Model	Predictor	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	FLCAS_FAC_1	.573	11.281	<.001	.466	.663
2	FLCAS_FAC_1	.506	8.763	<.001	.387	.611
	CompetenceFAC_1	.136	2.350	.020	.023	.264
3	FLCAS_FAC_1	.501	8.657	.000	.382	.607
	CompetenceFAC_1	.157	2.677	.008	.044	.288
	ExtraversFAC_1	.001	.019	.985	-.128	.131
	ExtraversFAC_2	.139	2.250	.025	.021	.312
	ExtraversFAC_3	.040	.701	.484	-.088	.186
4	FLCAS_FAC_1	.466	8.033	<.001	.347	.572
	CompetenceFAC_1	.161	2.795	.006	.050	.290
	ExtraversFAC_1	-.052	-.872	.384	-.191	.074
	ExtraversFAC_2	.137	2.257	.025	.021	.307
	ExtraversFAC_3	.002	.036	.972	-.135	.140
	OpennFAC_1	.172	3.216	.001	.072	.298

Table A13. Regression coefficients: multiple regression for L2WTC-OC.

Model	Predictor	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	FLCAS_FAC_1	.268	4.495	<.001	.143	.365
2	FLCAS_FAC_1	.174	2.577	.011	.039	.291
	CompetenceFAC_1	.192	2.840	.005	.060	.331
3	FLCAS_FAC_1	.150	2.233	.026	.017	.268
	CompetenceFAC_1	.198	2.914	.004	.065	.338
	ExtraversFAC_1	.123	1.807	.072	-.012	.278
	ExtraversFAC_2	.076	1.057	.291	-.075	.250
	ExtraversFAC_3	-.018	-.276	.783	-.175	.132
4	FLCAS_FAC_1	.131	1.919	.056	-.003	.252
	CompetenceFAC_1	.200	2.951	.003	.068	.340
	ExtraversFAC_1	.094	1.339	.182	-.048	.253
	ExtraversFAC_2	.075	1.045	.297	-.076	.249
	ExtraversFAC_3	-.039	-.568	.570	-.202	.111
	OpennFAC_1	.091	1.446	.149	-.034	.222

Appendix B (Questionnaires used in the study, Arabic and English versions)

L2 WTC (Second Language Willingness to communicate)

مدى استعدادك للتواصل بلغة ثانية

Outside classroom

خارج الفصل الدراسي

1 When you find your friend standing before you in a line.

عندما تجد صديقك يقف قبلك في الطابور.

2 When you find your acquaintance standing before you in a line.

عندما تجد أحد معارفك يقف قبلك في الطابور.

3 When you have a discussion in a small group of friends.

عندما تخوض نقاشًا ضمن مجموعة صغيرة من الأصدقاء.

4 When you have a chance to talk in a small group of strangers.

عندما تُتاح لك الفرصة للحديث ضمن مجموعة صغيرة من الغرباء.

Inside classroom

خارج الفصل الدراسي

5 When you are given a chance to talk freely in an English class.

عندما تُتاح لك الفرصة للحديث بحريّة في فصل اللغة الإنجليزية.

6 When you have a chance to talk in front of the class in an English class.

عندما تُتاح لك الفرصة للتحدّث أمام الطلاب في فصل اللغة الإنجليزية.

7 When you have a group discussion in an English class.

عندما يكون لديك نقاش جماعي في فصل اللغة الإنجليزية.

8 When you have a chance to make a presentation in front of a large group.

عندما تُتاح لك الفُرصة لتقديم عرض تقديمي (بوربوينت) أمام مجموعة كبيرة من الأشخاص.

L2 competence (Second Language Competence)

مدى كفاءتك في اللغة الثانية

Please rate your English competence in the following four fields (1-unsatisfactory to 6 excellent):

يُرجى تقييم مدى كفاءتك في اللغة الإنجليزية في المجالات الأربعة التالية (من 1 - غير مرضٍ إلى 6- ممتاز):

1. Speaking
2. Listening
3. Writing
4. Reading

1. المحادثة

2. الاستماع
3. الكتابة
4. القراءة

FLCAS (English version followed by the Arabic version)

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) Directions: Indicate your opinion about each statement by circling the alternative below that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement:

1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in language class.
3. I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class.
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the foreign language.
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.
6. During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at languages than I am.
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my language class.
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my foreign language class.
11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over foreign language classes.
12. In language class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class.
14. I would not be nervous speaking the foreign language with native speakers.
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.
16. Even if I am well prepared for language class, I feel anxious about it.
17. I often feel like not going to my language class.
18. I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class.
19. I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in language class.
21. The more I study for a language test, the more confused I get.
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for language class.
23. I always feel that the other students speak the foreign language better than I do.
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students.
25. Language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.
26. I feel more tense and nervous in language class than in my other classes.
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.
28. When I'm on my way to language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.
29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says.
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language.
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of the foreign language.
33. I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.

مقياس القلق في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية

توجيهات: عبّر عن رأيك حول كل عبارة عن طريق تحديد الخيار المناسب أدناه، والذي يشير بشكل أفضل إلى مدى موافقتك أو عدم موافقتك على كل عبارة:

1. لا أشعر مطلقًا بالثقة في نفسي عندما أتحدث في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
2. لا أقلق بشأن ارتكاب الأخطاء في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
3. أرتجف عندما أعلم أنه سيتم استدعائي في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.

4. أشعر بالخوف عندما لا أفهم ما يقوله المعلم باللغة الإنجليزية.
5. لن يزعجني أبدًا أن ألتحق بالمزيد من محاضرات اللغة الإنجليزية.
6. أثناء حضوري محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية، أجِد نفسي أفكر في أشياء لا تتعلق أبدًا بالمحتوى التعليمي.
7. أظل أفكر في أنّ الطلاب الآخرين أفضل مني في اللغة الإنجليزية.
8. عادةً ما أشعر بالراحة أثناء الاختبارات في اللغة الإنجليزية.
9. أخاف عندما أضطر إلى التحدث دون تحضير مسبق في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
10. أقلق بشأن عواقب رسوبي في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
11. لا أفهم لماذا يشعر بعض الأشخاص بالاستياء من محاضرات اللغة الإنجليزية.
12. في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية، قد أشعر بالتوتر لدرجة نسيان الأشياء التي أعرفها.
13. أشعر بالحرج عند التطوع بالإجابات في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
14. لا أشعر بالتوتر عند الحديث باللغة الإنجليزية مع المتحدثين الأصليين باللغة.
15. أشعر بالاستياء عندما لا أفهم ما يصحّحه المعلم.
16. حتى وإن كنت مستعدًا بشكل جيد لمحاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية، أشعر بالقلق حياله.
17. غالبًا ما أشعر برغبة في عدم الذهاب إلى محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
18. أشعر بالثقة عندما أتحدث في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
19. أخشى من أن يقوم المعلم بتصحيح كل خطأ أرتكبه.
20. يخفق قلبي بسرعة عندما يتم استدعائي في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
21. كلما درست أكثر من أجل اختبار اللغة الإنجليزية، زاد شعوري بالارتباك.
22. لا أشعر بالضغط عندما استعد جيدًا لمحاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
23. دومًا ما أشعر بأنّ الطلاب الآخرين يتحدثون اللغة الإنجليزية أفضل مني.
24. أشعر بالخجل الشديد من التحدث باللغة الإنجليزية أمام الطلاب الآخرين.
25. تسير محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية بسرعة لدرجة أني أقلق من عدم قدرتي على الفهم.
26. أشعر بالتوتر والعصبية في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية أكثر بما أشعر به في المحاضرات الأخرى.
27. أشعر بالتوتر والارتباك عند التحدث في محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية.
28. في طريقي إلى محاضرة اللغة الإنجليزية، أشعر بالثقة والاسترخاء.
29. أشعر بالتوتر عندما لا أفهم كل كلمة يقولها معلم اللغة الإنجليزية.
30. أشعر بالإرهاق من عدد القواعد التي يجب أن أتعلمها للتحدث باللغة الإنجليزية.
31. أخشى أن يسخر مني الطلاب الآخرون عندما أتحدث باللغة الإنجليزية.
32. أعتقد أني سأشعر بالراحة حول المتحدثين الأصليين للغة الإنجليزية.
33. أشعر بالتوتر عندما يطرح مدرس اللغة الإنجليزية أسئلة لم أقم بتحضير إجاباتٍ لها مسبقًا.

IPIP Questionnaire (only Openness to Experience and Extraversion)

How Accurately Can You Describe Yourself?

Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Indicate for each statement whether it is 1. Very Inaccurate, 2. Moderately Inaccurate, 3. Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate, 4. Moderately Accurate, or 5. Very Accurate as a description of you.

ما مدى دقة وصفك لنفسك؟

صِف نفسك بشكل عام في الوقت الحاضر، وليس كما ترغب أن تكون عليه في المستقبل. قدّم وصفًا صادقًا لنفسك كما تراها بالفعل مقارنة بالأشخاص الذين تعرفهم والذين هم من نفس جنسك وفي نفس عمرك تقريبًا. وحتى تتمكن من تقديم إجابات صادقة، سيتم الاحتفاظ بردودك بسرية تامة. لكل عبارة واردة في هذا الاستطلاع يمكنك، ولوصف نفسك، تحديد خيار واحد من بين:

1.غير دقيق للغاية، 2. غير دقيق إلى حدٍ ما، 3. محايد، 4. دقيق إلى حدٍ ما، 5. دقيق للغاية.

1. أنا روح وحياة أي حفلة (شخص قلّه).
2. لدي حصيلة قوية من المفردات (أعرف الكثير من الكلمات).
3. لا أتحدث كثيرًا.

4. أجِد صعوبة في فهم الأفكار المجردة.
5. أشعر بالراحة مع وجود الناس حولي.
6. لدي خيال واسع.
7. لا أحب أن أكون مركزًا للاهتمام.
8. لا أهتم بالأفكار المجردة.
9. أبادر (أبدأ) بالحديث مع الآخرين.
10. لدي أفكار ممتازة.
11. لدي القليل لقوله (لا أتحدث كثيرًا).
12. ليس لدي خيال واسع.
13. أتحدث مع الكثير من الناس في الحفلات والمناسبات.
14. أفهم الأشياء بسرعة.
15. لا أحب لفت الانتباه إلى نفسي.
16. أستخدم مفردات (كلمات) صعبة.
17. لا أمانع أن أكون مركز الاهتمام.
18. أقضي وقتًا في التفكير في الأشياء.
19. ابقى صامت (لا أتكلم) عندما أكون حول ناس غرباء لا أعرفهم.
20. لدي الكثير من الأفكار.

IPIP English version

Am the life of the party.

Have a rich vocabulary.

Don't talk a lot.

Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.

Feel comfortable around people.

Have a vivid imagination

Keep in the background

Am not interested in abstract ideas.

Start conversations.

Have excellent ideas.

Have little to say

Do not have a good imagination.

Talk to a lot of different people at parties.

Am quick to understand things.

Don't like to draw attention to myself.

Use difficult words

Don't mind being the center of attention.

Spend time reflecting on things

Am quiet around strangers.

Am full of ideas.