

An Examination of the Relationship Between Undergraduate Students' Personality Traits, Family Communication Patterns, Communication Skills, and Speaking Anxiety

Selvanur KAYHAN¹ , M. Kerem KOBUL² , Fatma ALTUN KOBUL³ , Bircan EYÜP⁴ 

Abstract: This study investigates the relationship between undergraduate students' speaking anxiety and their personality traits, family communication patterns, and communication skills. A total of 775 undergraduate students studying in 6 different faculties at a state university on the northeastern Türkiye participated in the research. The data was gathered using Demographic Information Form, Speech Anxiety Scale, Family Communication Patterns Scale, Communication Skills Scale and Personality Traits Scale. A multiple linear regression analysis was computed. The results indicate that the predictor variables accounted for at least 45% of the variance in speech anxiety. Extroversion ($\beta = -.46$), conscientiousness ($\beta = -.11$), openness to experience ($\beta = -.11$) personality traits and communication skills ($\beta = -.15$) variables predicted speech anxiety negatively, while neurotic personality traits ($\beta = .11$) and conformity-oriented family communication patterns ($\beta = .11$) were found to be positive significant predictors for the dependent variable of speech anxiety. The results of the study highlight the need for future research to examine the cognitive, affective and behavioral components of speaking anxiety separately.

Keywords: Speech anxiety, speaking skill, personality traits, communication skills, family communication patterns

Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Kişilik Özellikleri, Aile İletişim Kalıpları ve İletişim Becerileri ile Konuşma Kaygıları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

Öz: Bu çalışmanın amacı üniversite öğrencilerinin konuşma kaygıları ile kişilik özellikleri, aile iletişim kalıpları ve iletişim becerileri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Türkiye'nin kuzeydoğusunda bulunan bir devlet üniversitesinde 6 farklı fakültede öğrenim gören toplam 775 lisans öğrencisi araştırma grubunu oluşturmuştur. Çalışmanın verileri Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Konuşma Kaygısı Ölçeği, Aile İletişim Kalıpları Ölçeği, İletişim Becerileri Ölçeği ve Kişilik Özellikleri Ölçeği ile toplanmıştır. Veriler çoklu doğrusal

Geliş tarihi/Received: 13.10.2024

Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 07.04.2025

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

¹ Arş. Gör., Trabzon Üniversitesi, Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Bölümü, selvanurkayhan@trabzon.edu.tr, 0000-0002-6710-9815

² Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Samsun Üniversitesi, Mütercim ve Tercümanlık Bölümü, kerem.kobul@samsun.edu.tr, 0000-0002-7744-0712

³ Doç. Dr., Samsun Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, faltun@trabzon.edu.tr, 0000-0001-8523-7768

⁴ Doç. Dr., Trabzon Üniversitesi, Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Bölümü, bircaneyup@trabzon.edu.tr, 0000-0001-8061-1159

Atıf İçin/To Cite Kayhan, S., Kobul, M. K., Altun Kobul, F., & Eyüp, B. (2025). An examination of the relationship between undergraduate students' personality traits, family communication patterns, communication skills, and speaking anxiety. *Van Yüzüncü Yıl University Journal of Education*, 22(1), 298-324.

<https://doi.org/10.33711/yyuefd.1566404>

regresyon analizi ile hesaplanmış ve yordayıcı değişkenlerin konuşma kaygısındaki varyansın en az %45'ini açıkladığı görülmüştür. Dışa dönüklük ($\beta = -.46$), öz denetimlilik ($\beta = -.11$), deneyime açıklık kişilik özellikleri ($\beta = -.11$) ve iletişim becerileri ($\beta = -.15$) değişkenleri konuşma kaygısını negatif yönde yordarken nevrotik kişilik özellikleri ($\beta = .11$) ve uyum yönelimli aile iletişim kalıbının ($\beta = .11$) pozitif yönde anlamlı yordadığı bulunmuştur. Çalışmadan elde edilen sonuçlar konuşma kaygısının bilişsel, duyuşsal ve davranışsal bileşenlerini ayrı ayrı incelemek için gelecekteki araştırmalara duyulan ihtiyacı vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Konuşma kaygısı, konuşma becerisi, kişilik özellikleri, iletişim becerileri, aile iletişim kalıpları

Introduction

Having effective speaking skills is something that many people around the world would desire. However, for individuals experiencing speech anxiety, achieving proficiency in speaking can be particularly challenging. Individuals suffering from speech anxiety might experience a variety of unfavorable cognitive, physical, and behavioral conditions (Plandano et al., 2023; Raja, 2017; Sever & Topçuoğlu-Ünal, 2023). To begin with, the perceived lack of speaking skills and critical thoughts are cognitive elements that could disturb individuals and raise anxiety (Dwyer, 2005, p. 23). In addition, symptoms such as sweating, trembling, dry mouth and heart pounding (Allen et al., 2008; Campo, 2012) are widely-known physiological signs of anxiety. Even the mere idea of giving a speech to more than one person can cause individuals feel intense fear, embarrassment, and discomfort, which may lead them to avoid situations that the speech will take place (Ayres & Hopf, 1993; Breakey, 2005; Pull, 2012). Typical escape-avoidance, and security-seeking behaviors in the anxiety pattern exacerbate the situation and increasingly limit the individual's life (King & Smith, 2017). Speech anxiety can significantly hamper an individual's social life, education, and career development (Rajitha & Alamelu, 2020). It is well-documented that the majority of students and even teachers in many different cultures experience public speaking anxiety (Haeri, 2009; King & Smith, 2017). Furthermore, research has clearly demonstrated that speech anxiety affects university absenteeism in addition to lowering students' academic performance (Dörnyei, 2008; Finning et al., 2019). Consequently, numerous individuals might suffer from speech anxiety and endure such adverse cognitive, bodily, and behavioral symptoms.

For this reason, a significant portion of the studies in the field focus on treatment and/or intervention methods to reduce speech anxiety (Bodie, 2010; Sülter et al., 2022). However, predicting and preventing a problem before it occurs is always considered as more efficient, put differently, economical method in terms of time and effort (Konnopka & König, 2020). Thus, identifying the causes of speech anxiety is crucial for both designing preventive studies and being able to offer diverse intervention programs. However, it is not an easy task as a vast array of diverse and complex variables are documented to have impact on speech anxiety. To illustrate, situational variables such as individuals' perceptions of themselves, the novelty of the environment, hierarchical relationships (Beatty, 1988; Young, 1991), past experiences of the individuals as well as individual differences per se are identified as predisposing factors that have been proven to be influential in research exploring the origins of speech anxiety within the extant literature (Booth-Butterfield, 1989; Levine & McCroskey, 1990). Thus, current study aims to investigate the extent to which familial and personal variables collectively account for speech anxiety.

Learning to speak a language and how to use it in a variety of interpersonal interactions, as

Hymes (1972) posits “communicative competence”, is mainly acquired within the family and generally lasts lifelong (Botta & Dumlao, 2002; Peterson & Green, 2009). Moreover, research clearly demonstrates that children's capacity to construct a suitable mental model for addressing their feelings and thoughts and healthy communication patterns depends mainly on adequate communication with their parents and open discussion of their feelings and thoughts (Kelly et al., 2002; Kobul, 2022). Conjointly, Ritchie and Fitzpatrick, (1990) identify family communication patterns in two dimensions: conversation-orientation and conformity-orientation. Families with a high conversation-orientation allow interaction on any subject, whereas families with a high conformity-orientation expect parents' opinions to be accepted without question (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). In this regard, a negative relationship is expected between speech anxiety and conversation-orientation, while a positive relationship is expected between speech anxiety and conformity-orientation (Huang, 2010; Inkinen, 2022; Schrodts & Shimkowski, 2017). Besides, the possible impact of family communication patterns on speech anxiety is highlighted by the well-established links between communication anxiety and family communication patterns (Elwood & Schrader, 1998), reluctance to communicate and reticence (Kelly et al., 2002). Correspondingly, such a communicative and open discussion environment is expected to benefit children by alleviating their anxiety about expressing themselves and fostering good communication patterns.

Attributing the origin of speech anxiety solely to familial communication patterns is undoubtedly inadequate. Interpersonal variables, or more aptly put, individual differences should also be taken into account in anxiety studies. Personality traits and communication skills, a significant part of which are shaped within the family and then continue to develop in other social environments, can be evaluated in this respect (Duncan & Magnuson, 2003; Erdoğan, 2021). Remarkably, a burgeoning body of research suggests that speaking anxiety is related to communication skills (Can & Bozgün, 2021; Khan, 2015; Martini et al., 1992). Individuals with developed communication skills experience less speech anxiety because they can express their feelings and thoughts clearly, fluently and effectively (Prentiss, 2021). Individuals who can express themselves comfortably are more confident in verbal interactions and can communicate without fear of making mistakes. Therefore, effective communication skills are crucial for reducing speech anxiety and enabling an individual to move more comfortably in social situations (Can & Bozgün, 2021).

Personality traits comprise an individual's abilities, motivation, attitude, and character attributes that are formed as a result of diverse experiences and behaviors (Brandstätter, 2011). Thus, people with different personality traits may experience varying levels of speech anxiety. The recent body of literature provides extensive evidence on these differences (Booth-Butterfield, 1989; Nel, 2008; Taylor & Broffman, 2011). According to the widely used five-factor personality model, personality traits are classified as neuroticism, extroversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & John, 1992). A significant body of research based on the relationship between personality traits and speech anxiety continues to thrive. To illustrate, Dwyer and Cruz (1998) demonstrated that communication apprehension was significantly related to introversion and extroversion. In addition, research has convincingly identified extroversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness and openness to experience as predictors of public speaking anxiety (Kelsen, 2019; MacIntyre & Thivierge, 1995). More broadly, a number of recent findings suggest that foreign language speaking anxiety is significantly related to extroversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience, neuroticism and agreeableness (Ehrman & Leaver, 2003; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Kelsen, 2019; Vural, 2019).

With these caveats in mind, current study mainly investigates the role of communication skills, personality traits and family communication patterns in explaining college students' speech anxiety. Even a brief glance over the relevant literature reveals that the majority of studies on public speaking are characterized by descriptive studies which basically depict the circumstances (Akalın & Adıgüzel, 2020; Gündüz & Demir, 2022a; Özkan & Kınay, 2015; İşcan & Karagöz, 2016). Besides, studies on speech anxiety tend to focus on foreign and/or second language speaking anxiety (Abbasi et al., 2019; Ateş, & Bahşi, 2022; Coppinger & Sheridan, 2022; Hamzadayı & Büyükkız, 2015; Mede & Kararımak, 2017; Özalp & Merç, 2022; Sönmez & Kurtoglu, 2021; Sun, & Teng, 2021; Tridinanti, 2018; Vural, 2019); conversely, research on speech anxiety in the mother tongue remains uneven and unsatisfactory (Can & Bozgün, 2021; Ensar & Gündüz, 2022; Gündüz & Demir, 2022b; Şahan & Doğan-Kahtali, 2021). However, speaking skill is very important for even native speakers, given that it serves as the primary, and in some cases exclusive, mode of communication, particularly in societies without a writing system (Ong, 2002). This makes speech per se significant equally in anthropological grounds. More succinctly, speaking skill is also a crucial skill for university students too. Explicitly stated, undergraduate students are required to use public speaking skills during their education period as well as throughout their professional careers (Ayres & Hopf, 1993; Gallego et al., 2022). However, research has revealed that a considerable amount of university students suffers from public speaking anxiety (Allen et al., 2008; Dwyer & Davidson, 2012; Grieve et al., 2021; McCroskey et al., 1989). In light of these, research on the variables that may be related to speaking anxiety gain due gravity in terms of paving the way for future studies aimed at alleviating students' speech anxiety (Ayres & Hopf, 1993; Taylor & Broffman, 2011). However, there is famine of research that examines and explains the influence of communication skills, family communication patterns, and personality traits on speech anxiety together.

The aim of this study is to investigate the role of communication skills, personality traits and family communication patterns in explaining university students' speech anxiety. For this purpose, the following hypotheses were tested:

H1. There are significant relationships between family communication patterns, communication skills, personality traits and speech anxiety.

H2. Family communication patterns significantly predict speech anxiety.

H3. Communication skills significantly predict speech anxiety.

H4. Personality traits significantly predict speech anxiety.

H5. Family communication patterns, communication skills, and personality traits significantly predict speech anxiety.

Method

Study Design

The study was designed in accordance with a correlational research approach. In social sciences, the primary objectives of correlational research are to elucidate and predict the relationships between variables. When a sufficiently strong relationship exists between two variables, it becomes feasible to estimate the value of one variable based on the known value of the other (Fraenkel et al., 2012; Karasar, 2015). For the purposes of this study, the design was specifically oriented towards prediction.

Participants and Context

The study was conducted at a state university on the northeast Türkiye. Convenience sampling method was utilized. It is well-articulated in the literature that it is difficult to reach a true random sampling in social sciences, thus convenience sampling is commonly used in social sciences (Fraenkel et al., 2012). A total of 775 university students (Female= 70.3%, Male= 29.7%) from 6 different faculties were recruited for the study. Majority of the participants were students from the faculty of education (59%), followed by the participants from the faculties of theology (16%), law (7.7%), communication (7.2%), sports sciences (7.2%) and fine arts (2.8%), respectively. Table 1 summarizes the socio-demographic information of the students who voluntarily participated in the study. Participants' consent was taken and they were fully informed that their data will be kept confidential and anonymous.

Table 1

Descriptive Results of Participants

Variable	f	%
Gender		
Female	545	70.3
Male	230	29.7
Faculty of Study		
Faculty of Education	457	59.0
Faculty of Law	60	7.7
Faculty of Theology	124	16.0
Faculty of Communication	56	7.2
Faculty of Sport Sciences	56	7.2
Faculty of Fine Arts	22	2.8
Year of Study		
1 st Year	237	30.6
2 nd Year	114	14.7
3 rd Year	197	25.4
4 th Year and more	227	29.3
Household Income Level		

Lower	59	7.6
Middle	663	85.9
Upper	50	6.5
Mother Education Level		
Unschooler	70	9.0
Primary	340	43.9
Secondary	158	20.4
High School	145	18.7
University	62	8.0
Mother Education Level		
Unschooler	19	2.5
Primary	216	27.9
Secondary	144	18.6
High School	209	27.0
University	185	23.9

Data Collection Instruments

Personal Information Form: It was created by the researchers to determine some demographic and personal information about the research group. The form includes questions about gender, faculty of study, grade level, family economic status, place of long-term residence, and parents' educational status.

Speaking Anxiety Scale: It was developed by Sevim (2012) to determine the speaking anxiety of pre-service teachers. The scale consists of three factors and 20 items. The first factor is speaker-oriented anxiety, the second factor is environment-oriented anxiety and the third factor is speaking psychology. These three dimensions explained 51.98% of the total variance. Factor loadings were found to vary between .40 and .78. The scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The reliability coefficient of the scale was found as .91, .89 in the first factor, .82 in the second factor and .87 in the third factor (Sevim, 2012). The reliability analysis conducted on the sample of this study revealed a Cronbach's alpha value of .94.

Family Communication Patterns Scale: The scale was developed by Chaffee et al. (1973) and revised by Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (1990) as the Revised Family Communication Patterns Scale. It was adapted into Turkish by Erdoğan and Anık (2018). The scale consists of 26 items and two dimensions: conversation orientation and conformity orientation. The scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .88 for conversation orientation and .81 for adaptation orientation. In the scale, the variance explained by conversation orientation was found to be 35.218% and the variance explained by conformity orientation was found to be 22.946% (Erdoğan & Anık, 2018). Reliability analyses of the scale were re-conducted on the data obtained from university students, who form the sample of this study. The analysis resulted in a Cronbach's alpha value of .70.

Communication Skills Scale: It was developed by Korkut-Owen and Bugay (2014) to

determine the communication skills of university students. The scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 25 items. The scale consists of four sub-factors: Communication Principles and Basic Skills (PCBS), Personal Expression (PE), Non-Verbal Expression (NVE), and Willingness to Communicate (WTC). The fit index values of the scale were [$\chi^2(268) = 377.73$, $p < .0001$; χ^2/df ratio = 1.40; CFI = .91, IFI = 0.91, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .046, SRMR = .068]. The internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be .88. The internal consistency was .79 in the first sub-factor, .72 in the second sub-factor, .64 in the third sub-factor and .74 in the fourth sub-factor (Korkut-Owen & Bugay, 2014). The Cronbach's alpha value obtained for the sample of this study is .89.

Personality Traits Scale: The ten-item personality scale developed by Rammstedt and John (2007) was adapted to Turkish culture by Horzum et al. (2017). It consists of five sub-factors: “Extroversion”, “Agreeableness”, “Conscientiousness”, “Neuroticism” and “Openness to Experience”. The scale consists of 10 items. The internal consistency of the scale was .88 and composite .83 for extroversion, .81 and composite .73 for agreeableness, .90 and composite .85 for conscientiousness, .85 and composite .79 for neuroticism, and .84 and composite .78 for openness to experience. In the adaptation study, it was found that the five-factor structure explained 88.4% of the total variance. The fit index values of the scale were found as RMSEA=.062, GFI=.96, AGFI=.91, CFI=.98, NFI=.97 and SRMR=.035 (Horzum et al., 2017). The reliability coefficient calculated for the sample of this study was computed for the five personality dimensions, and it was found to range between .72 and .79.

Research Procedure

Firstly, research and ethical approval were obtained from the Trabzon University Social and Human Sciences Research and Ethics Committee (Issue Number: E-81614018-000-2200013188, 28/03/2022). Then, the self-report scales were administered to the students of the Faculty of Education, Theology, Law, Communication, Sport Sciences, and Fine Arts in the spring semester of 2021-2022. Before the scales were administered, the students were informed about the research and the scales were introduced. Besides, the students were assured that their responses would only be used only for research purposes and their data would be kept anonymous. The scales were administered to volunteer students in the classroom setting. The administration of the instruments took approximately 20-25 minutes.

Data Analysis

All data analyses were performed using IBM SPSS version 26. Descriptive statistical techniques, including means, standard deviations, and frequencies, were used to summarize participants' characteristics and determine whether parametric or non-parametric tests should be applied. Skewness and kurtosis values were calculated to assess data normality (De Vaus, 2002; Larson-Hall, 2015). The kurtosis and skewness coefficients are summarized in Table 2. Multiple linear regression analysis was preferred to explain speaking anxiety due to its ability to simultaneously assess the impact of multiple predictors on a single outcome, offering a more comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing speaking anxiety.

Results

Multivariate regression analysis was used to determine the predictive levels of participants' family communication patterns, five-factor personality traits and communication skills on their speech anxiety. Firstly, Pearson correlation coefficient was used to test whether there was a

multicollinearity problem among the independent variables. A high level of correlation ($r=.90$ and above) between independent variables is defined as multicollinearity (Pallant, 2016, p. 167). Table 2 demonstrates that the highest relationship between the variables is between the sub-dimensions of family communication patterns with $-.46$. This result reveals that there is no multicollinearity problem in the model. In addition, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values in this study ranged from 1.07 to 1.36, and the Tolerance values ranged from 0.73 to 0.93, indicating that there was no multicollinearity problem. Statistically, VIF values should ideally be below 10, and Tolerance values should be above 0.1 to ensure that multicollinearity is not a concern (Pallant, 2016). Auto-correlation was examined with the Durbin Watson test. The obtained value of 1.92 was found to be within the expected ranges (1.5-2.5) (Kalaycı, 2010).

Table 2

Correlations and Descriptive Findings of the Research Data

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Speech Anxiety	1								
2. Extroversion ^a	-.60**	1							
3. Agreeableness ^a	.09*	.02	1						
4. Conscientiousness ^a	-.36**	.34**	.12**	1					
5. Neuroticism ^a	.30**	-.24**	-.17**	-.14**	1				
6. Openness ^a	-.27**	.19**	.06	.18**	-.13**	1			
7. Conversation-oriented ^b	-.19**	.25**	.09*	.12**	-.07*	.10**	1		
8. Conformity-oriented ^b	.24**	-.16**	-.14**	-.17**	.19**	-.06	-.46**	1	
9. Communication skills	-.41**	.35**	.19**	.29**	-.23**	.27**	.24**	-.17**	1
Mean	49.26	6.97	8.12	7.34	6.09	6.79	50.46	31.17	99.32
Std. Deviation	15.45	2.17	1.47	1.77	1.82	1.87	10.71	8.45	11.83
Skewness	.24	-.33	-.76	-.48	.07	-.21	-.54	.09	-.25
Kurtosis	-.48	-.70	.82	-.07	-.34	-.39	.43	-.42	.24

** $p < .01$ a= Five Factor Personality Scale Subscale; b= Family Communication Patterns Scale Subscale

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression analysis using the Enter method, the model was found to be significant ($F_{8, 766} = 79.99, p < .001$). The variance explained by family communication patterns, five-factor personality traits, and communication skills, selected as predictor variables for speech anxiety, was 45% ($\Delta R^2 = .45$). The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 illustrates the influence of individual variables on speaking anxiety through standardized coefficients (β). Specifically, extroversion ($\beta = -.46, p < .001$) was found to have a negative relationship with speaking anxiety, indicating that higher levels of extroversion are associated with lower levels of anxiety. Conscientiousness ($\beta = -.11, p < .01$) and openness to experience ($\beta = -.11, p < .01$) also showed negative relationships, suggesting that more conscientious and open individuals tend to experience less anxiety. Conversely, neuroticism ($\beta = .11, p < .01$) demonstrated a positive relationship, meaning that individuals with higher levels of neuroticism are more likely to experience greater speaking anxiety.

Additionally, conformity-oriented family communication patterns ($\beta = .11$, $p < .01$) were positively associated with speaking anxiety, indicating that individuals from families with a higher focus on conformity tend to experience more anxiety. Communication skills ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .01$) showed a negative relationship, meaning that better communication skills are linked to lower levels of speaking anxiety.

Table 3

Regression Analysis Results for Explanation of Speaking Anxiety

Model	B	H	β	t	95% Confidence Interval		F _(df)	R	ΔR^2
Constant	90.20	5.59		16.13**	79.22	101.18	79.99 _(8,766) **	.45	.45
Extroversion ^a	-3.24	.22	-.46	-14.91**	-3.67	-2.82			
Agreeableness ^a	-.04	.29	-.01	-.14	-.61	.53			
Conscientiousness ^a	-.99	.26	-.11	-3.89**	-1.49	-.49			
Neuroticism ^a	.91	.24	.11	3.77**	.44	1.39			
Openness ^a	-.87	.23	-.11	-3.78**	-1.33	-.42			
Conversation-oriented ^b	.07	.05	.05	1.47	-.02	.15			
Conformity-oriented ^b	.20	.06	.11	3.54**	.09	.31			
Communication skills	-.20	.04	-.15	-5.00**	-.28	-.12			

** $p < .01$ a= Five Factor Personality Scale Subscale; b= Family Communication Patterns Scale Subscale

Discussion

Both common sense observation and a preponderance of research evidence suggest that the social, intellectual, and professional aspects of people's lives are immensely impacted by speech anxiety. It stands as a crucial impediment to their advancement, achievements, and effective communication in these domains. Moreover, as a relatively prevalent type of anxiety (Kahlon et al., 2019) it has been documented to have negative impact on students' academic achievement at the university level (Allen et al., 2008; Grieve et al., 2021). Accordingly, current study aims to examine the predictive role of personality traits, communication skills, and family communication patterns on university students' speech anxiety. The analyses revealed that personality traits, communication skills and family communication patterns together explained 45% of the total variance of speech anxiety. This clearly demonstrates that the variables discussed in the study are important predictors for speech anxiety (Larson-Hall, 2015). Furthermore, it would not be unwise to claim that this result of the study will contribute to the literature in terms of providing confirmatory evidence on the importance of individual and familial factors and child rearing conditions that might cause speech anxiety in undergraduate students.

On the basis of empirical evidence, it seems fair to suggest that personality traits play an important role in predicting and explaining individuals' emotions, thoughts and actions (McCrae & Costa, 1995). In this regard, personality traits are expected to be significant in explaining speech anxiety, which involves emotions, thoughts and actions together (Booth-Butterfield, 1989). By the same token, the results of this study indicate that extroversion, conscientiousness, and openness to

experience predict speech anxiety negatively whereas neuroticism predicts it positively. Put another way, individuals with high level of extroversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience significantly less speaking anxiety, while individuals with high level of neuroticism experience intense speaking anxiety. However, given that personality traits are bipolar, the results of the study indicate that introverts experience speech anxiety more intensely in contrast to extroverts. Likewise, the results also reveal that individuals who scored low on openness and who have low conscientiousness also have speech anxiety, albeit at a low level. However, in contrast to neurotic individuals with high speaking anxiety, it might be fair to claim that individuals with a balanced emotional state experience less speaking anxiety. Last but not least, agreeableness was not found to be a significant predictor.

Additionally, a considerable amount of published work emphasizes the role of personality traits on second/foreign language speaking anxiety, public speaking anxiety and communication anxiety (Bahrudin & Amir, 2018; Booth-Butterfield, 1989; Can & Bozgün, 2021; Dewaele, 2013; Dow, 1941; Hamed et al., 2015; Hamzadayı & Büyükkiz, 2015; Khan, 2015; Kelsen, 2019; Martini et al., 1992). However, it is reasonable to assume that the results obtained from this research are noteworthy in explaining the anxiety that people experience in speaking even their mother tongue that they frequently need to use in their daily routine. Moreover, a glance at the extant literature indicates that most of the studies on personality traits and speaking anxiety were largely conducted in countries other than Türkiye which is another aspect that makes this study remarkable. Put succinctly, the relationship between undergraduate students' speech anxiety levels and personality traits has received very little scholarly attention from researchers. This represents also an apparent dearth of literature on the cultural elements that play a nonnegligible role in human perception and cognition (DiMaggio, 1997). In this sense, it is reasonable to assume that data from Turkish context, considered a predominantly collectivist culture (Hofstede et al., 2010; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2017), substantially contributes to the field by enhancing our understanding of the predictive role of family communication patterns, five-factor personality traits and communication skills on undergraduate students' speech anxiety. Based on the findings of this study, there is merit to highlight that personality traits are much more dominant on speech anxiety despite numerous cultural elements.

Another important finding emerged from the study was that extroversion predicted speech anxiety at a higher level compared to other personality traits. This result is critical in that introversion, which lays on the other end of extroversion, also predicts speaking anxiety. There is a large volume of research showing a negative correlation between extroversion and second/foreign language communication and speaking anxiety, and a positive correlation with introversion (Bahrudin & Amir, 2018; Hamed et al., 2015; Hamzadayı & Büyükkiz, 2015; Kelsen, 2019). Additionally, there is compelling evidence indicating positive correlation between extroversion and oral performance/communication skills in a second/foreign language, and a negative correlation between introversion and those skills (Busch, 1982; Kelsen & Liang, 2018; Liang & Kelsen, 2018). Not surprisingly, literature is rife with work suggesting that extroverted individuals are more advantageous in verbal communication than other individuals (Dewaele & Furnham, 2000). Conversely, it is not possible to talk about such a benefit for introverts, because introverts are not so willing to engage in conversation and interact with other people (Wei, 2013; Zhang, 2008). However, according to MacIntyre and Thivierge (1995) the extroversion/introversion dichotomy is the personality attribute that most consistently explains speech anxiety. The fact that extroverts are sociable, active, have positive emotions, like to take risks, are more relaxed, attach

importance to social interaction makes them self-motivated individuals for verbal communication. On the contrary, introverts are individuals who tend to avoid communication because they possess traits that are nearly opposite to those mentioned about extroverts (Cook, 2001; Krashen, 1982; Swain, 1993; Wei, 2013). In the current study, extroversion predicted speaking anxiety at a higher level compared to other personality traits, which corroborates the findings of a great deal of extant literature. In addition, it is a remarkable finding in that it has the highest predictive power among all predictor variables in this study. This is also a striking result in terms of showing the role of extroversion personality trait in speech anxiety despite the profound influence of communication skills and family communication patterns on personality development.

Another remarkable result to emerge from the data is that conscientiousness and openness to experience personality traits also predicted speaking anxiety, though at a low level. This also indicates that individuals with low conscientiousness and openness also experience speaking anxiety albeit to a lesser extent. In the same vein, Kelsen (2019) also found that there was a low relationship between foreign language learners' public speaking anxiety and the personality traits of conscientiousness and openness to experience. In another study, Kelsen and Liang (2018) found a significant positive relationship between university students' oral presentation performance in a second language and conscientiousness, but not with openness to experience. Openness to experience is one of the personality traits with a high intellectual aspect, and there is convincing evidence indicating its relationship with verbal intelligence (Nosal, 1999 as cited in Bahrudin & Amir, 2018). For this reason, it was expected to predict speech anxiety at a higher level in our study. However, it is thought that family communication patterns, which are regressed together, are effective in this low level of predictive power. A synthesis of conscientiousness literature by Grieve et al. (2021) demonstrated that self-regulation is one of the most prevalent sources of anxiety among college students who are afraid of oral presentations and public speaking. The researchers contended that students' anxiety during a speech was caused by poor preparation, lack of command over the subject matter, or, put another way, their incapacity to regulate the process. In Turkey, as another cultural milieu, Erdoğan (2018) discovered that due to their upbringing with the expectation that they should never make a mistake, university students who are overburdened with responsibility and who possess a high degree of responsibility tend to feel increased anxiety when they speak in public. There is also evidence suggesting that individuals who have higher level of conscientiousness also have higher job performance compared to individuals with other personality traits (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Likewise, discipline, planning and control are very important for individuals with high conscientiousness (Costa & McCrae, 2008). Therefore, it seems plausible to infer that people experience higher level of speech anxiety when these requirements are not fulfilled since they are unable to execute their performances as they would like.

Neurotic individuals with trait anxiety (Dewaele, 2013) are considered to be more prone to language learning anxiety and speech anxiety (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996). Findings of the current study indicate that individuals with neurotic personality traits experience more speech anxiety. Otherwise stated, individuals with balanced and stable moods experience less speaking anxiety. This result corroborates the findings of other studies that examined communication anxiety, learning anxiety and presentation anxiety in a foreign language (Dow, 1941; Kelsen, 2019). In addition, studies (Kelsen & Liang, 2018; Liang & Kelsen, 2018) that found a significant negative relationship between the ability to present and communicate in a second language and neurotic personality traits also confirm the findings of this study. Moreover, Grieve et al. (2021) and Shanahan (2013) found that university students showed various physical and emotional symptoms

such as panic attacks due to fear, heart pounding, body trembling, facial flushing, sweaty hands, or wanting to cry due to emotional intensity during public and oral presentations. In a similar vein, Ensar and Gündüz (2022), who examined the relationship between pre-service teachers' public speaking anxiety and their psychological resilience, found that there was a significant negative relationship between these two factors. Correspondingly, individuals with high psychological resilience can manage their emotional states better (Sarrionandia et al., 2018) as they can adapt to stressful, anxious or negative situations more easily (American Psychological Association, 2023; Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004). All of these emphasize the significance of the neurotic personality trait, which complicates the management of emotions in a balanced manner, when predicting speech anxiety. However, these results contradict some published studies that do not support this and report that neuroticism is completely independent of language learning and communication anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989). More recently, literature has emerged that found no relationship between speaking in a foreign language and neuroticism (Oya et al., 2004). By and large, although there is substantial amount of literature that support the results of the current study, a number of other investigations documented contradictory findings. This makes it unsafe to make general evaluations on neuroticism.

Another striking result to emerge from the data is that agreeableness did not emerge as a significant predictor for speaking anxiety. Contrary to the findings of this study, conventional wisdom has it that individuals who are self-contented, non-skeptical and agreeable are more likely to engage in more effective communication with others (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; McCrae & John, 1992), while individuals who do not have these characteristics might prefer to communicate less. In like manner, there is a wealth of literature indicating that individuals with high agreeableness are more willing to communicate in second language learning (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996). A contributing factor to this outcome could be the desire to acquire a new language. On the other hand, Kelsen and Liang (2018) did not find a significant relationship between agreeableness and students' oral presentation performance in a foreign language. Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that the disparity between these results could be attributed to differences in the research design, with one study concentrating on direct communication and the other centering on students' collaborative oral presentation performances. As common belief suggests, individual and collaborative studies may yield different results for individuals (Tajeddin & Bagherkazemi, 2014). However, oral presentation which requires public speaking can also induce various anxieties (Allen et al., 2008). Along somewhat similar lines, Schlenker and Leary (1982) categorize public speaking anxiety as social anxiety. Additionally, during their speeches, individuals may focus not only on the content of their speech but also on how the audience perceives them. They might be more concerned about the audience's opinion of themselves because, as highlighted by Pinquart & Sörensen (2000), being respected and receiving positive feedback on one's behavior and attitudes are considered crucial factors in one's subjective well-being and positive self-concept. In a different vein, Bippus and Daly (1999) discovered that individuals who have a low tolerance for making mistakes experience increased public speaking anxiety, whereas past experiences serve to decrease this anxiety. More broadly, Ferreira-Marinho et al. (2017) also found that students who were dissatisfied with their voices experienced more fear of public speaking. These findings indicate that individuals with lower level of agreeableness experience public speaking anxiety more intensely. However, caution should be exercised in evaluating the results of these studies since most of the studies in the literature focus on foreign language or public speaking anxiety. Thus, the existing accounts fail to provide sufficient data to evaluate the results of our study. Hence, more scholarly attention should be paid to examine the relationship between agreeableness and speaking

anxiety in participants' mother tongue.

Family communication patterns offer significant insights into the communication environment within the family (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Hall & Scharp, 2018). These patterns are well documented to have influence on how children will behave at a later age (Becker, 1993; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). There is a large volume of published studies revealing that children who grow up in conformity-oriented families (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990) experience severe communication problems. There's merit to reiterate that in conformity-oriented families children are the ones who are supposed to conform to the family rules rather than the mutual exchange of thoughts, feelings and opinions. In such families, ideas and decisions are accepted without questioning, there is no discussion about any topic, there is a homogeneous structure regarding beliefs and attitudes. Put differently, there is no comfortable communication environment within the family, and the children are not allowed to express themselves in any way (Elwood & Schrader, 1998; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2017; Keaten & Kelly, 2000). In the same vein, findings of this study indicate that conformity-oriented family communication pattern is a significant predictor for explaining students' speech anxiety. This result confirms that although the sample of the current study consists of university students who live away from their families in their undergraduate years (Doğan & Akçalı, 2021), they maintain the conformity-oriented family communication patterns to which they were exposed throughout their childhood even in their university life (Hamilton et al., 2011; Phillips & Lonigan, 2005). In this regard, Hofstede et al. (2010) define cultural thought and behavior patterns acquired in the family at an early age as "mental software" (p. 384). They liken it to the lifelong operating system of a computer and emphasize that these patterns form the basis of people's behaviors throughout their lives, even if they might not be consciously aware of it. Another remarkable result that emerged from the data is that there was a significant, albeit small, negative relationship between the conversation-oriented family communication pattern and speech anxiety (see Table 2). However, when regressed on personality traits and communication skills, this effect was found to be quite small. Thus, this finding identified that the conversation-oriented family communication pattern is not a significant predictor for explaining speech anxiety when combined with other variables.

On the other hand, it was hypothesized that growing up in the conversation-oriented families (Hart & Risley, 1995; Keating et al., 2013) where there are opportunities for deeper conversations, discussions on challenging topics, and the expression of feelings and thoughts, would negatively predict speech anxiety in individuals. In line with this, Schrodtt, Witt, and Messersmith (2008), who conducted a meta-analysis study on the relationship between family communication patterns and psychosocial factors, found that the conversation-oriented family communication patterns made a more significant contribution to predicting psychosocial outcomes than conformity-oriented family communication patterns. However, our results indicated that the conformity-oriented family communication pattern is a more robust predictor of speech anxiety (Carrillo et al., 2001), which encompasses both psychological and psychosocial dimensions. Nevertheless, these two dimensions mutually influence each other. Explicitly stated, in order to fully understand how one dimension impacts speech anxiety, a thorough understanding of the other dimension is necessary (Erdoğan & Anık, 2018; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). To illustrate, in families where conversation-oriented communication is low and conformity-oriented communication is high, protective features gain gravity (Phillips & Lonigan, 2005). In these families, obedience to parents is expected, it is believed that parents should make the decisions, and thus, children cannot share their feelings and thoughts enough (Fitzpatrick & Ritchie, 1994).

Considering that these factors are effective in shaping the child's personality, why the conformity-oriented family communication pattern predicts speech anxiety when regressed on personality traits and communication skills in this study becomes quite understandable. In addition, results of this study conducted in Turkey can be interpreted within the light of the characteristics of the Turkish family structure. This can be attributed to the protective nature of the Turkey family structure, which involves increased parental control, expressions of hostility, and even instances of rejection during childhood, leading to a negative impact on individuals' self-confidence (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2017; Şahan & Doğan-Kahtali, 2021). In the same vein, Şahan and Doğan-Kahtali (2021) also found that irrational beliefs, self-esteem and the need for social approval have a complete mediating role in the relationship between family attitudes and speech anxiety among university students in Turkey. In another noteworthy study, Erdoğan (2018) found that some of the female university students, particularly those who grew up in authoritarian families, were not allowed to speak much in their childhood just because they were girls. As a result, they continue to experience considerable anxiety when speaking in public. As a reflection of the patriarchal norms in the society, it is extensively documented that women are traditionally positioned as subordinate to men and have almost no right to speak simply because they are women (Mueller & Parcel, 1981) and they carry the traces of these attitudes from their childhood even up to their adulthood (Bradby, 2009; Klasen, 2000). Moreover, another plausible interpretation is that a significant proportion of the undergraduate students recruited for this study were female and this might be deemed decisive in this result.

Individuals who feel anxiety while speaking do not feel comfortable in the communication process and thus cannot express themselves properly (Erdoğan, 2018; Eysenck et al., 2007). Findings emerged from this study revealed that as individuals' speaking anxiety decreased, their communication skills increased. A substantial amount of literature both in foreign language (Khan, 2015; Martini et al., 1992) and studies conducted in mother tongue anxiety (Allen et al., 2008; Can & Bozgün, 2021) reveal a negative relationship between speaking anxiety and communication skills. What is more, Beatty and Andriate (1985) remark that communication anxiety may occur particularly in individuals who experience public speaking anxiety at their early ages. It is reasonable to claim that this may negatively affect individuals' communication skills as anxiety arises as a result of the incompatibility between the difficulties encountered and the perceived coping mechanisms (Baran-Lucarz, 2013). Furthermore, when the individuals have high self-efficacy, which results in belief and hope to solve a difficulty faced, they do not generate negative thoughts in their minds and do not experience anxiety. This is supported by the literature, which demonstrates growing evidence of a positive correlation between speaking self-efficacy and communication skills (Baki, 2018). Hence, it is reasonable to predict that as the individual's self-efficacy belief increases communication skills improve, but communication skills will suffer when a person experiences anxiety instead of strong self-efficacy belief (Allen et al., 2008; Booth-Butterfield, 1989; Levine & McCroskey, 1990). Consequently, it is plausible to infer that whether people have speech anxiety or not has a significant impact on improvement of their communication skills.

Conclusion

The results obtained in the study are presented below:

1. Personality traits, communication skills and family communication patterns together explained 45% of the total variance of speech anxiety.

2. When personality traits, family communication patterns and communication skills are pooled into regression analysis, it emerges that extraversion is as the strongest predictor among all variables.
3. Extraversion, conscientiousness and openness to experience predicted speaking anxiety negatively, whereas neuroticism predicted it positively.
4. Agreeableness among personality traits did not predict speech anxiety at a significant level.
5. Among the family communication patterns, the conversation-oriented communication pattern did not predict speech anxiety at a significant level, whereas the adjustment-oriented family communication pattern predicted speech anxiety positively.
6. Communication skills negatively predicted speech anxiety.

These results have some implications that merit mention and open avenues for future research. The study shows a relationship between an individual's personality traits, communication skills, and speech anxiety. This clearly highlights the need for future research to examine the cognitive, affective, and behavioural components of speech anxiety separately. In particular, studies can explore which component is more dominant in different situations. To examine these components, experimental or mixed-method studies can be conducted beyond the survey studies that are more commonly preferred in the literature. Considering the role of the family factor in speech anxiety, its reflections in different cultural contexts can be explored. For example, the level and causes of speech anxiety can be compared between individualistic and collectivist societies. It is further recommended that individual and familial factors that cause speech anxiety should be carefully addressed and examined by different statistical models such as path analysis and structural equation model. The findings of our study do not support the results of previous research and clearly reveal the need for further studies that take these variables into account. This study focuses on university students in a single country. Therefore, analysing different populations in different parts of the world and making comparisons may contribute more to the literature in terms of explaining speech anxiety. Moreover, intervention programs should be developed to alleviate this anxiety. Notably, there is every reason to suggest that numerous trainings, which pay particular attention to personality characteristics of individuals, can and should be provided under the psychologists' and/or psychological counselors' supervision. In terms of family communication patterns, necessary follow-up programs can be provided in schools and various seminars on how to communicate with their children can be organized for the families who are in immediate need. These anxiety-reducing programs can be offered through various in-class and out-of-class activities that can be organized by classroom teachers and mother tongue language teachers. In addition to these, a brief glance through the relevant literature clearly demonstrates that studies regarding the causes of speaking anxiety are mostly conducted in foreign/second languages, yet studies in the mother tongue are mostly conducted only for identifying the situation. However, speaking anxiety is prevalent among undergraduate students (Plandano et al., 2023; Raja, 2017) and it is a serious situation that is encountered not only in foreign/second languages (Chen, 2024) but also in their mother tongue (Erdoğan, 2018; İşcan & Karagöz, 2016; Raja, 2017; Sever & Topçuoğlu-Ünal, 2023). Taken together, these issues necessitate further detailed studies to address the causes of speaking anxiety even in mother tongue contexts.

Limitations of The Study

The present study offers also some limitations that must be acknowledged. First of all, the study is limited to students studying at a single state university and departments in the field of social sciences. In order to increase the generalizability of the results, the findings of the study can

be tested with larger samples in various other cultural and/or geographical contexts. Another limitation is the possibility that the results obtained from the data collection tools based on the participants' self-evaluations may not fully reflect the measured qualities as might be in any self-report study. Thus, data collection tools should be based not only on students' self-reports but also on peer, teacher and family evaluations too. In the current study, only the role of individual and familial factors on speaking anxiety were investigated. However, since speech anxiety also includes psychological, cultural and social factors, studies that examine how much these psychological factors predict speech anxiety are recommended for further work.

Ethics Committee Permission Information: This research was carried out with the permission of Trabzon University Social and Human Sciences Research and Ethics Committee with the decision 28/03/2022 numbered E-81614018-000-2200013188.

Author Conflict of Interest Information: The author declares that there is no conflict of interest with any institution or person within the scope of the study.

Statement of Contribution Rate: The authors declare that they have made equal contributions to the article.

References

- Abbasi, A. M., Ahmed, S. R., Farooqi, A., & John, S. (2019). Exploring factors of speech anxiety in second language classroom. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(5), 97-102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.s.v.10n.5p.97>
- Akalın, S., & Adıgüzel, A. (2020). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin konuşma kaygı düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 28(3), 1345-1356. <https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.3956>
- Allen, M., Burrell, N., & Bourhis, J. (2008). Coping with the needs of presentation. In G. Rickheit & H. Strohner (Eds.), *Handbook of communication competence. Handbook of applied linguistics* (Vol. 1, pp. 343-358). NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- American Psychological Association. (2023). Resilience. Retrieved from: <https://www.apa.org/topics/resilience>
- Ateş, A., & Bahşi, N. (2022). The effects of emotional intelligence of the foreign students learning Turkish language on speaking and writing anxiety. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 5(4), 160-171. <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1993.05.04.582>
- Ayres, J., & Hopf, T. (1993). *Coping with speech anxiety*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Bahrudin, H., & Amir, Z. (2018). The relationship between personality traits and English language speaking anxiety among faculty of economics and management undergraduates in UKM. *Jurnal Wacana Sarjana*, 2(4), 1- 17.
- Baki, Y. (2018). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının konuşma öz yeterlikleri ve iletişim becerilerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies Educational Sciences*, 13(19), 213-233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13949>
- Baran-Łucarz, M. (2013). Phonetics learning anxiety-results of a preliminary study. *Research in Language*, 11(1), 57-79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2478/v10015-012-0005-9>

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x>
- Beatty, M. J. (1988). Situational and predispositional correlates of public speaking anxiety. *Communication education*, 37(1), 28-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528809378701>
- Beatty, M. J., & Andriate, G. S. (1985). Communication apprehension and general anxiety in the prediction of public speaking anxiety. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(3), 174-184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463378509369596>
- Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. NY: University of Chicago Press.
- Bippus, A. M., & Daly, J. A. (1999). What do people think causes stage fright?: Naïve attributions about the reasons for public speaking anxiety. *Communication Education*, 48(1), 63-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634529909379153>
- Bodie, G. D. (2010). A racing heart, rattling knees, and ruminative thoughts: Defining, explaining, and treating public speaking anxiety. *Communication Education*, 59(1), 70-105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903443849>
- Booth-Butterfield, S. (1989). The relationship between state and trait communication anxiety. *Communication Research Reports*, 6, 19-25.
- Botta, R. A., & Dumlaio, R. (2002). How do conflict and communication patterns between fathers and daughters contribute to or offset eating disorders?. *Health Communication*, 14(2), 199-219. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327027HC1402_3
- Bradby, H. (2009). *Medical sociology: An introduction*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446211724>
- Brandstätter, H. (2011). Personality aspects of entrepreneurship: A look at five meta-analyses. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(3), 222-230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.07.007>
- Breakey, L. K. (2005). Fear of public speaking-the role of the SLP. *Seminars in Speech Language*, 26, 107-117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1055/s-2005-871206>
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extraversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*, 32(1), 109-132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1982.tb00521.x>
- Can, F., & Bozgün, K. (2021). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin iletişim becerileri ile konuşma kaygıları arasındaki ilişki. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 10(3), 1124-1136.
- Campo, J. V. (2012). Annual research review: Functional somatic symptoms and associated anxiety and depression-developmental psychopathology in pediatric practice. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 53(5), 575-592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02535.x>
- Carrillo, E., Moya-Albiol, L., González-Bono, E., Salvador, A., Ricarte, J., & Gómez-Amor, J. (2001). Gender differences in cardiovascular and electrodermal responses to public speaking

- task: The role of anxiety and mood states. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 42(3), 253-264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-8760\(01\)00147-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-8760(01)00147-7)
- Chaffee, S. H., McLeod, J. M., & Wackman, D. B. (1973). Family communication patterns and adolescent political participation. In J. Dennis (Ed.), *Socialization to politics* (pp. 349-364). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Chen, Y. (2024). Effects of technology-enhanced language learning on reducing EFL learners' public speaking anxiety. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(4), 789–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2055083>
- Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Coppinger, L., & Sheridan, S. (2022). Accent anxiety: An exploration of non-native accent as a source of speaking anxiety among English as a foreign language (EFL) students. *Journal for the Psychology of Language Learning*, 4(2), 1-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.52598/jpll/4/2/6>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). The five-factor model of personality and its relevance to personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 6(4), 343–359. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/pedi.1992.6.4.343>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2008). The revised neo personality inventory (neo-pi-r). In G. J. Boyle, G. Matthews & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality, theory and assessment* (Vol. 2, pp. 179–198). Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849200479>
- De Vaus, D. (2002). *Surveys in social research*. Routledge.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2013). The link between foreign language classroom anxiety and psychoticism, extraversion, and neuroticism among adult bi- and multilinguals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(3), 1-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12036.x>
- Dewaele, J. M., & Furnham, A. (2000). Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(2), 355-365. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(99\)00106-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00106-3)
- DiMaggio, P. (1997). Culture and cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23(1), 263-287. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.23.1.263>
- Doğan, H., & Akçalı, G. (2021). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşadıkları sosyo-ekonomik sorunlar üzerine bir inceleme. *Journal of University Research*, 4(3), 309-316. <https://doi.org/10.32329/uad.903559>
- Dow, C. W. (1941). The personality traits of effective public speakers. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 27(4), 525-532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00335634109380696>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2008). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Duncan, G. J., & Magnuson, K. A. (2003). Off with Hollingshead: Socioeconomic resources, parenting, and child development. In M. H. Bornstein & R. H. Bradley (Eds.), *Monographs in parenting series. Socioeconomic status, parenting, and child development* (pp. 83-106). Oxon: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Dwyer, K. K. (2005). *Conquer your speech anxiety: Learn how to overcome your nervousness about public speaking* (2nd ed.). Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Dwyer, K. K., & Cruz, A. M. (1998). Communication apprehension, personality, and grades in the basic course: Are there correlations?. *Communication Research Reports*, 15(4), 436-444. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08824099809362143>
- Dwyer, K. K., & Davidson, M. M. (2012). Is public speaking really more feared than death?. *Communication Research Reports*, 29(2), 99-107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2012.667772>
- Ehrman, M., & Leaver, B. L. (2003). Cognitive styles in the service of language learning. *System*, 31(3), 393-415. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00050-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00050-2)
- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(1), 67-89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb05417.x>
- Elwood, T. D., & Schrader, D. C. (1998). Family communication patterns and communication apprehension. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 13(3), 493.
- Ensar, F., & Gündüz, A. (2022). Öğretmen adaylarının psikolojik sağlamlıklarının topluluk önündeki konuşma kaygılarıyla ilişkisi. *Ana Dili Eğitimi Dergisi*, 10(1), 266-276. <https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.946373>
- Erdoğan, Ö. (2018). Üniversite öğrencilerinde topluluk önünde konuşma kaygısının nedenleri ve geliştirilen baş etme mekanizmaları. *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi*, 10(47), 351-367.
- Erdoğan, Ö. (2021). Aile iletişim kalıpları ve ebeveyn kaygısı bağlamında çocuklarda iletişim kaygısı üzerine bir araştırma. *Social Sciences Research Journal*, 10(1), 162-173.
- Erdoğan, Ö., & Anık, C. (2018). Aile iletişim kalıpları ölçeğinin Türkçe formunun geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Türkiye İletişim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 29, 21-46.
- Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336-353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.336>
- Ferreira-Marinho, A. C., A. Mesquita de Medeiros, Côrtes Gama, A. C., & Caldas Teixeira, L. (2017). Fear of public speaking: Perception of college students and correlates. *Journal of Voice*, 31(1), 7-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2015.12.012>
- Finning, K., Ukoumunne, O. C., Ford, T., Danielsson-Waters, E., Shaw, L., Romero De Jager, I., Stentiford, L., & Moore, D. A. (2019). The association between child and adolescent depression and poor attendance at school: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 245, 928-938. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.11.055>
- Fitzpatrick, M. A., & Ritchie, L. D. (1994). Communication schemata within the family: Multiple perspectives on family interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 20(3), 275-301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1994.tb00324.x>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Gallego, A., McHugh, L., Penttonen, M., & Lappalainen, R. (2022). Measuring public speaking anxiety: Self-report, behavioral, and physiological. *Behavior Modification*, 46(4), 782-798. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0145445521994308>
- Grieve, R., Woodley, J., Hunt, S. E., & McKay A. (2021). Student fears of oral presentations and public speaking in higher education: A qualitative survey. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(9), 1281-1293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1948509>
- Gündüz, A., & Demir, S. (2022a). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin konuşma kaygıları. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi*, 12(2), 709-726. <https://doi.org/10.30783/nevsosbilen.985315>
- Gündüz, A., & Demir, S. (2022b). Öğrencilerin duygusal zekâlarının konuşma kaygılarıyla ilişkisi. *Okuma Yazma Eğitimi Araştırmaları*, 10(2), 136-156. <https://doi.org/10.35233/oyea.1137521>
- Haeri, N. (2009). The elephant in the room: Language and literacy in the Arab world. In D. Olsen & R. Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of literacy* (pp. 418-430). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609664.023>
- Hall, E. D., & Scharp, K. M. (2018). Testing a mediational model of the effect of family communication patterns on student perceptions of the impact of the college transition through social communication apprehension. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 46(49), 429-446. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2018.1502461>
- Hamed, S. M., Akbari, O., & Hamed, S. M. (2015). An investigation of the extraverts-introverts speaking anxiety in English classes. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 284-293. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/selt.v3n3p284>
- Hamilton, L., Werum, R., Steelman, L. C., & Powell, B. (2011). Changing family, changing education. In M. T. Hallinan (Ed.), *Frontiers in sociology of education* (pp. 205-223). NY: Springer.
- Hamzadayı, E., & Büyükikiz, K. K. (2015). Türkçe öğrenen yabancı öğrencilerin konuşma becerisi öz-yeterlik algıları ile kişilik tipleri arasındaki ilişki. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1(1), 297-312.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Paul H Brookes Publishing.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (Vol. 2). NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Horzum, M. B., Ayas, T., & Padır, M. A. (2017). Beş faktör kişilik ölçeğinin Türk kültürüne uyarlanması. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 7(2), 398-408. <http://dx.doi.org/10.19126/suje.298430>
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-285). London: Penguin Books.
- Huang, Y. (2010). *Family communication patterns, communication apprehension and soci-communicative orientative orientation: A study of chinese students* (Master's thesis, University of Akron).

- Inkinen, M. (2022). *Family communication patterns and adolescent social anxiety*. Tampere University.
- İşcan, A., & Karagöz, B. (2016). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının konuşma kaygılarının incelenmesi Gaziosmanpaşa üniversitesi örneği. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(3), 193-206.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, C. (2017). *Family, self, and human development across cultures: Theory and applications*. NY: Routledge.
- Kahlon, S., Lindner, P., & Nordgreen, T. (2019). Virtual reality exposure therapy for adolescents with fear of public speaking: a non-randomized feasibility and pilot study. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 13(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-019-0307-y>
- Karasar, N. (2015). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Nobel.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2010). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri*. Asil.
- Keaten, J. A., & Kelly, L. (2000). Reticence: An affirmation and revision. *Communication Education*, 49(2), 165-177. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634520009379203>
- Keating, D. M., Russell, J. C., Cornacchione, J., & Smith, S. W. (2013). Family communication patterns and difficult family conversations. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 41(2), 160-180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2013.781659>
- Kelly, L., Keaten, J., Finch, C., Duarte, I., Hoffman, P., & Michels, M. (2002). Family communication patterns and the development of reticence. *Communication Education*, 51(2), 202-209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634520216506>
- Kelsen, B. A. (2019). Exploring public speaking anxiety and personal disposition in EFL presentations. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 73(0), 92-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.05.003>
- Kelsen, B. A., & Liang, H.Y. (2018). Role of the big five personality traits and motivation in predicting performance in collaborative presentations. *Psychological Reports*, 122(5), 1907-1924. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294118795139>
- Khan, S. M. (2015). Influence of speech anxiety on oral communication skills among ESL/EFL learners. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(6), 49-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.6n.6p.49>
- King, J., & Smith, L. (2017). 6. Social anxiety and silence in Japan's tertiary foreign language classrooms. In C. Gkonou, M. Daubney & J. Dewaele (Eds.), *New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications* (pp. 91-109). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Klasen, S. (2000). Does gender inequality reduce growth and development? Evidence from cross-country regression. *World Bank Economic Review*, 7, 1-36.
- Kobul, M. K. (2022). Coğrafya kader midir? Çocuğun dil gelişiminde aile ve toplumsal tabaka etkenleri. In H. Mertol, O. Yılmaz, Ö. Ü. H. Hadimli & Ü. Yasak (Eds.), *Çocuk mekân coğrafya* (pp. 237-263). Vizetek Yayıncılık.

- Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1997) Family type and conflict: The impact of conversation orientation and conformity orientation on conflict in the family. *Communication Studies*, 48(1), 59-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510979709368491>
- Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of family communication. *Communication Theory*, 12(1), 70-91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2002.tb00260.x>
- Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2006). Family communication patterns theory: A social cognitive approach. In D. O. Braithwaite & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), *Engaging theories in family communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 50-65). London: Sage Publications, Inc. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452204420.n4>
- Konnopka, A., & König, H. (2020). Economic burden of anxiety disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pharmacoeconomics*, 38(1), 25-37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-019-00849-7>
- Korkut-Owen, F., & Bugay, A. (2014). İletişim becerileri ölçeği'nin geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(2), 51- 64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17860/efd.95021>
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press Inc.
- Larson-Hall, J. (2015). *A guide to doing statistics in second language research using SPSS and R*. NY: Routledge.
- Levine, T. R., & McCroskey, J. C. (1990). Measuring trait communication apprehension: A test of rival measurement models of the PRCA-24. *Communications Monographs*, 57(1), 62-72. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/03637759009376185>
- Liang, H. Y., & Kelsen, B. (2018). Influence of personality and motivation on oral presentation performance. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 47(4), 755-776. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-017-9551-6>
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15(1), 3-26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0261927X960151001>
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, 39, 251-275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1989.tb00423.x>
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Thivierge, K. A. (1995) The effects of speaker personality on anticipated reactions to public speaking. *Communication Research Reports*, 12(29), 125-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099509362048>
- Martini, M., Behnke, R. R., & King, P. E. (1992). The communication of public speaking anxiety: Perceptions of Asian and American speakers. *Communication Quarterly*, 40(3), 279-288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379209369842>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1995). Trait explanations in personality psychology. *European Journal of Personality*, 9(4), 231-252. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2410090402>

- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60(2), 175-215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x>
- McCroskey, J. C., Booth-Butterfield, S., & Payne, S. K. (1989). The impact of communication apprehension on college student retention and success. *Communication Quarterly*, 37(2), 100-107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463378909385531>
- Mede, E., & Karairmak, Ö. (2017). The predictor roles of speaking anxiety and English self-efficacy on foreign language speaking anxiety. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators*, 6(1), 117-131.
- Mueller, C. W., & Parcel, T. L. (1981). Measures of socioeconomic status: Alternatives and recommendations. *Child Development*, 52(1), 13-30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129211>
- Nel, C. (2008). Learning style and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 49-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ong, W. J. (2002). *Orality and literacy*. NY: Routledge.
- Oxford, R. L., & Ehrman, M. E. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23(3), 359-386. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00023-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00023-D)
- Oya, T., Manalo, E., & Greenwood, J. (2004). The Influence of personality and anxiety on the oral performance of Japanese speakers of English. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 18(7), 841-855. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1063>
- Özalp, Ö. S., & Merç, A. (2022). The relationship between speaking anxiety and willingness to communicate: A quantitative inquiry. *Anadolu University Journal of Education Faculty (AUJEF)*, 6(3), 294-311. <https://doi.org/10.34056/aujef.1082682>
- Özkan, E., & Kınay, İ. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının konuşma kaygılarının incelenmesi (Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi örneği). *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 4(3), 1290-1301.
- Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS kullanma kılavuzu: SPSS ile adım adım veri analizi* (S. Balcı & B. Ahi, Trans.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Pearson, J. C., DeWitt, L., Child, J. T., Kahl, D. H., & Dandamudi, V. (2007). Facing the fear: An analysis of speech-anxiety content in public-speaking textbooks. *Communication Research Reports*, 24(2), 159-168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08824090701304923>
- Peterson, R., & Green, S. (2009) *Families first: Keys to successful family functioning communication*. Virginia: Virginia State University.
- Phillips, B. M., & Lonigan, C. J. (2005). Social Correlates of Emergent Literacy. In M. J. Snowling & C. Hulme (Eds.), *The science of reading: A handbook* (pp. 173-187). Blackwell Publishing.
- Pinquart, M., & Sörensen, S. (2000). Influences of socioeconomic status, social network, and competence on subjective well-being in later life: a meta-analysis. *Psychology and Aging*, 15(2), 187-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.15.2.187>
- Plandano, R. G., Otagan, J. M. C., Saavedra, M. M., Sumampong, A. J., Tirol, G. O., & Ederio, N. T. (2023). Public Speaking Anxiety among College Students at St. Paul University

Surigao. *Int. J. Curr. Sci. Res. Rev*, 6(02), 1443-1447. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V6-i2-63>

- Prentiss, S. (2021). Speech anxiety in the communication classroom during the COVID-19 pandemic: supporting student success. *Frontiers in Communication*, 6, 642109. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.642109>
- Pull, C. B. (2012). Current status of knowledge on public-speaking anxiety. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 25(1), 32-38. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ycp.0b013e32834e06dc>
- Raja, F. (2017). Anxiety level in students of public speaking: Causes and remedies. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 4(1), 94-110.
- Rajitha, K., & Alamelu, C. (2020). A study of factors affecting and causing speaking anxiety. *Procedia Computer Science*, 172, 1053-1058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.05.154>
- Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the big five inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41(1), 203-212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2006.02.001>
- Ritchie, L. D., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1990). Family communication patterns: Measuring intrapersonal perceptions of interpersonal relationships. *Communication Research*, 17(4), 523-544. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/009365090017004007>
- Sarrionandia, A., Ramos-Díaz, E., & Fernández-Lasarte, O. (2018) Resilience as a mediator of emotional intelligence and perceived stress: A cross-country study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(2653), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02653>
- Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1982). Social anxiety and self-presentation: A conceptualization model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92(3), 641-669. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.92.3.641>
- Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Messersmith, A. S. (2008) A meta-analytical review of family communication patterns and their associations with information processing, behavioral, and psychosocial outcomes. *Communication Monographs*, 75(3), 248-269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750802256318>
- Schrodt, P., & Shimkowski, J. R. (2017). Family communication patterns and perceptions of coparental communication. *Communication Reports*, 30(1), 39-50. Doi: 10.1080/08934215.2015.1111400
- Sever, A., & Topçuoğlu-Ünal, F. (2023). Examination of university students' talking concerns against the community. *The Journal of International Education Science*, 10 (34), 84-98.
- Sevim, O. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarına yönelik konuşma kaygısı ölçeği: bir geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Turkish Studies-International Periodical for The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 7(2), 927-937. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.2981>
- Shanahan, D. (2013). High oral communication apprehensives: How can students be helped to reduce their fear of public speaking?. *Irish Journal of Academic Practice*, 2(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.21427/D72F09>
- Sönmez, G., & Kurtoğlu, M. (2021). Impact of perfectionism and self-compassion feelings of undergraduate students on their foreign language speaking anxiety. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews*, 10(2), 230-240. https://doi.org/10.52963/PERR_Biruni_V10.N2.16

- Sun, P. P., & Teng, L. S. (2021). Why so nervous? Revisiting the sources of speech anxiety in Chinese as a second language. *System*, 103, 102647. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102647>
- Sülter, R. E., Ketelaar, P. E., & Lange, W. G. (2022). SpeakApp-Kids! Virtual reality training to reduce fear of public speaking in children-A proof of concept. *Computers & Education*, 178, 104384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104384>
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 158-164. <https://doi.org/10.3138/CMLR.50.1.158>
- Şahan, B., & Doğan-Kahtali, B. (2021). The role of parental attitudes, irrational beliefs, need for social approval and self-esteem in speech anxiety. *European Journal of Alternative Education Studies*, 6(1), 96-115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejae.v6i1.3729>
- Tajeddin, Z., & Bagherkazemi, M. (2014). Short-term and long-term impacts of individual and collaborative pragmatic output on speech act production. *Teaching English Language*, 8(1), 141-166.
- Taylor, S. E., & Broffman, J. I. (2011). Psychosocial resources: Functions, origins, and links to mental and physical health. In J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 44, pp. 1-57). Elsevier Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385522-0.00005-6>
- Tridinanti, G. (2018). The correlation between speaking anxiety, self-confidence, and speaking achievement of undergraduate EFL students of private university in Palembang. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 6(4), 35-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.4p.35>
- Tugade, M. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 320-333. <https://doi.org/10.1037%2F0022-3514.86.2.320>
- Vural, H. (2019). The relationship of personality traits with English speaking anxiety. A study on Turkish university students. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, 1(1), 55-74. <https://doi.org/10.46303/repam.01.01.5>
- Wei, L. (2013). Conceptual and methodological issues in bilingualism and multilingualism research. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism* (2nd ed., pp. 26-51). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does the anxiety research suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 426-439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1991.tb05378.x>
- Zhang, Y. (2008). The role of personality in second language acquisition. *Asian Social Science*, 4(5), 58-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v4n5p58>

Geniş Özet

Giriş

Konuşma kaygısı etkili sözlü iletişimin önündeki en önemli engellerden biri olarak kabul edilmekte ve onlarca yıldır akademik tartışmaların merkezinde yer almaktadır. Daha somut bir ifadeyle, konuşma kaygısı, konuşma korkusu (Ayres & Hopf, 1993) ya da konuşmaya karşı bir tepki (Demir & Melanlıoğlu, 2014; Dörnyei, 2008) olarak kendini gösterebildiğinden (Pearson vd., 2007) birçok birey için birincil endişe kaynağı olarak kabul edilmektedir.

Topluluk önünde etkili konuşma becerisine sahip olmak dünya çapında pek çok insanın arzu ettiği bir şeydir. Bu nedenle alandaki çalışmaların önemli bir kısmı konuşma kaygısını azaltmaya yönelik tedavi ve/veya müdahale yöntemlerine odaklanmaktadır (Bodie, 2010; Sültner vd., 2022). Bununla birlikte bir sorunu ortaya çıkmadan önce tahmin etmek ve önlemek, zaman ve çaba açısından her zaman daha verimli ve ekonomik bir yöntem olarak kabul edilir (Konnopka & König, 2020). Bu nedenle, konuşma kaygısının nedenlerini belirlemek hem önleyici çalışmalar tasarlamak hem de çeşitli müdahale programları sunabilmek için çok önemlidir. Ancak, çok çeşitli ve karmaşık değişkenlerin konuşma kaygısı üzerinde etkisi olduğu belgelendiği için bu kolay bir iş değildir. Örneğin, bireylerin kendilerine ilişkin algıları, ortamın yeniliği, hiyerarşik ilişkiler (Beatty, 1988; Young, 1991), bireylerin geçmiş deneyimleri ve bireysel farklılıklar gibi durumsal değişkenler, mevcut literatürde konuşma kaygısının kökenlerini araştıran çalışmalarda etkili olduğu kanıtlanmış yatkinlaştırıcı faktörler olarak tanımlanmaktadır (Booth-Butterfield, 1989; Levine & McCroskey, 1990). Bu nedenle, mevcut çalışma ailesel ve kişisel değişkenlerin konuşma kaygısını ne ölçüde açıkladığını incelemeye odaklanmıştır. Bu doğrultuda bu çalışmanın amacı lisans öğrencilerinin konuşma kaygılarının açıklanmasında kişilik özellikleri, iletişim becerileri ve aile iletişim kalıplarının rolünü belirlemektir.

Yöntem

Araştırma grubunu Türkiye'nin kuzeydoğusunda bulunan bir devlet üniversitesinde 6 farklı fakültede öğrenim gören toplam 775 (545 Kadın, 230 Erkek) lisans öğrencisi oluşturmuştur. Örneklem seçiminde kolay örneklem yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın verileri Kişisel Bilgi Formu, Konuşma Kaygısı Ölçeği, Aile İletişim Kalıpları Ölçeği, İletişim Becerileri Ölçeği ve Kişilik Özellikleri Ölçeği ile toplanmıştır.

Öncelikle Trabzon Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırma ve Etik Kurulundan onay alınmıştır (Sayı no: E-81614018-000-2200013188, 28.03.2022). Sonrasında ölçekler, 2021-2022 bahar yarıyılı içerisinde Eğitim, İlahiyat, Hukuk, İletişim, Spor Bilimleri ve Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi öğrencilerine uygulanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde IBM SPSS 26 paket programından yararlanılmıştır. Verilerin normal dağılıma uygun olup olmadığı, basıklık ve çarpıklık değerleri ile test edilmiştir. Katılımcılara ait tanımlayıcı bulguların elde edilmesinde ve verilerin parametreye uygunluğunun tespitinde tanımlayıcı istatistik teknikleri kullanılmıştır. Konuşma kaygısının açıklanmasında çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi tercih edilmiştir.

Bulgular

Enter yönteminden yararlanılarak yapılan çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi sonucunda kurulan modelin sırasıyla anlamlı olduğu belirlenmiştir ($F_{8,766}=79.99, p<.001$). Yordayıcı değişken olarak seçilen aile iletişim kalıpları, beş faktör kişilik özellikleri ve iletişim becerilerinin ölçüt değişkeni olarak seçilen konuşma kaygısı ile ilgili açıkladığı varyans %45'tir ($\Delta R^2=.45$). Analize ait sonuçlar Tablo 3'te sunulmuştur. Tablo 3 incelendiğinde kişilik özelliklerinden dışadönüklük

($\beta=-.46, p<.001$), öz denetimlilik (sorumluluk) ($\beta=-.11, p<.01$), deneyime açıklık ($\beta=-.11, p<.01$) ve nevroz (nevroz) ($\beta=.11, p<.01$) ile uyum yönelimli aile iletişim kalıbı ($\beta=.11, p<.01$) ve iletişim becerileri ($\beta=-.15, p<.01$) değişkenlerinin öğrencilerinin konuşma kaygıları üzerinde anlamlı yordayıcılar olduğu görülmektedir.

Sonuç ve Tartışma

Çalışmanın sonuçları Türkiye'deki üniversite öğrencilerinin konuşma kaygılarını açıklamada kişilik özelliklerinin, iletişim becerilerinin ve yetiştikleri ailedeki iletişim kalıplarının dikkate değer yordayıcılar olduğunu gösteren önemli kanıtlar sunmaktadır. Bununla birlikte kişilik özellikleri, aile iletişim kalıpları ve iletişim becerileri birlikte regresyona girdiğinde kişilik özelliklerinden dışa dönüklüğün tüm değişkenler arasındaki en güçlü yordayıcı olduğunu ortaya koyması açısından da dikkate değer sonuçlar sunmaktadır. Kişilik özelliklerinden yumuşak başlılığın ve aile iletişim kalıplarından diyalog yönelimli iletişim kalıbının konuşma kaygısını anlamlı düzeyde yordamadıkları da dikkat çeken bir sonuçtur.

Bu sonuçlar doğrultusunda konuşma kaygısına neden olan bireysel ve ailesel faktörlerin dikkatle ele alınıp incelenmesi ve bu kaygının iyileştirilmesine yönelik müdahale programlarının geliştirilmesi önerilmektedir. Özellikle bireylerin kişilik özellikleri dikkate alındığında psikologlar veya psikolojik danışmanların öncülüğünde çeşitli eğitimlerin verilebileceği düşünülmektedir. Aile iletişim kalıpları açısından okullarda gerekli takipler yapılarak ihtiyaç duyan öğrencilerin ailelerine yönelik çocuklarıyla nasıl iletişim kuracaklarına dair çeşitli seminerler düzenlenebilir. Konuşma becerisi özelinde özellikle sınıf öğretmenleri ve Türkçe öğretmenlerinin düzenleyebileceği çeşitli sınıf içi ve dışı etkinliklerle konuşma kaygısı yaşayan öğrencilerin kaygılarının azaltılmasına önem verilmelidir. Bunlarla birlikte konuşma kaygısının nedenlerine dair çalışmaların çoğunlukla yabancı/ikinci dile yönelik yapıldığı ancak ana dilinde daha çok durum tespitine yönelik çalışmalar yapıldığı görülmüştür. Oysaki konuşma kaygısı bugün oldukça yaygın bir durum olup sadece yabancı/ikinci dilde değil ana dilinde de karşımıza çıkan ciddi bir durumdur. Bu sebeple ana dilindeki konuşma kaygısının nedenlerinin de belirlenmesine yönelik ayrıntılı çalışmalara ihtiyaç vardır.

Çalışmanın sınırlılıkları değerlendirildiğinde ise öncelikle çalışma sadece bir devlet üniversitesinde ve sosyal bilimler alanında öğrenim gören öğrencilerle sınırlıdır. Sonuçların genellenebilirliğini artırmak için daha geniş örneklemelerle de çalışmanın bulguları sınanabilir. Diğer bir sınırlılık ise veri toplama araçlarının katılımcıların kendi şahsi değerlendirmelerine dayalı olmasından elde edilen sonuçların ölçülen nitelikleri tam olarak yansıtmama olasılığı mevcuttur. Bu sebeple veri toplama araçlarının sadece öğrencilerin öz bildirimine dayalı değil; akran, öğretmen, aile değerlendirmelerine yönelik de olması beklenir. Bu çalışmada sadece konuşma kaygısı üzerinde bireysel ve ailesel faktörlere odaklanılmıştır. Ancak konuşma kaygısı psikolojik, kültürel, sosyal öğeleri de içerisinde barındırdığından gelecekte yapılacak olan çalışmalarda bu psikolojik öğelerin konuşma kaygısını ne kadar yordadığı da incelenebilir.