Aggression and Oral proficiency: A Correlational Study

Reza Ghafar Samar
&
Mansooreh Amiri
Tarbiat Modares University

Abstract
In order to investigate the relationship between aggressiveness and oral proficiency of Iranian EFL learners, first a TOEFL test was given to 100 EFL students in order to homogenize the sample. Out of this, 71 participants whose scores fell one standard deviation above and below the mean were regarded as intermediate and, therefore, interviewed. They were then asked to complete the Persian version of a validated aggression questionnaire. All the tape-recorded interviews were rated by two raters. Based on their scores on aggression questionnaire, the subjects were divided into two groups of aggressives and non-aggressives and the means of their scores in oral interviews were compared using t-test. Results of the t-test showed that, aggressive and non aggressive groups are different in their oral proficiency. Finally, the correlations between the two main variables and also between four subscales of aggression and all the components of oral proficiency were estimated to see exactly what the nature of the relationships is. Overall, the results of these calculations showed that aggression negatively affects oral proficiency of L2 learners. Moreover, *verbal aggression* and *anger* as different subscales of aggressiveness were found to have negative effect on the components of oral proficiency.

Key Words: Aggression, Oral proficiency, Iranian EFL learners.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Introduction

A teacher contemplating a new class of students can be confident of one fact: the students will be very different from one another. Some of these differences will suggest themselves at the outset as the teacher looks through the class register where names will reflect the gender and possibly the ethnic, religious, or social background of the students, but differences among learners will become more salient to the teacher as the class begins its work. Very soon some of the learners will be seen to make more rapid progress than others and may display special talents or aptitudes. The lack of progress of other pupils will become of concern to the teacher and in some cases professional advice may be sought. Some learners may be docile and others difficult, some keen to work, others easily distracted. There will be learners who establish effective relationships with the teacher and get on well with others, but others who are withdrawn, awkward or demanding (Crozier, 1997).

The skillful teacher will search for the individual approach that seems to work with particular students in gaining their interests and attentions, in finding appropriate ways to analyze the tasks they find difficult, in responding to their successes and failures (Crozier, 1997).

An often discussed issue in the field of second language learning is the influence and importance of individual differences (IDs); and it has been claimed that individual differences form a complex system in the learner. But little consensus has been reached regarding the exact definitions of these constructs and their relative importance (Harrison, 2004). In most English classes, we may confront different students' behavior among which the behavior of *aggressive* learners are the conspicuous ones, but most of the teachers in our country have not yet been taught to identify learner's characteristics. The focus in the educational system has always been on the material, changing the curriculum, and the transfer of the content but not on

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

the teacher and learners as human being who have preferences and interests (Bahri, 2003). As a result, the current situation in most classrooms is that diverse learner's preferences are rarely, if ever, considered in a systematic fashion. In this regard, *aggression* as one of the most important personality traits is said to have undeniable impact on learners' verbal communication, more specifically their oral proficiency. In spite of the significance of *aggression* in the field of individual differences in learning, few studies have been done to measure this personality trait and its possible effect on oral proficiency. The main purpose of this study is, hence, to explore the possible relationship between aggressiveness and Iranian EFL learners' oral proficiency.

It is hoped that the results of this study provide insights into the relationship between this personality trait (in defining exactly who is an aggressive learner) and Iranian EFL learner's oral proficiency. The findings of this study may help language teachers and those involved in language teaching and learning to devise more efficient training programs, materials, procedures and methods that are best suited the special personality traits of their students.

Personality, Aggression and L2 Speech Production

Individuals differ in the way they speak and write. Some of these differences are systematic and can be attributed to apparently deeper differences as personality traits (e.g., motivation and shyness) (McDonough, 1995), which have been found to significantly influence an individual's language production behavior in a variety of contexts. In fact, variation in the performance of the learners has always raised controversies in education; and investigating the link between individual differences and language learning and its different components has proved as an interesting topic to language teachers and researchers (Crozier, 1997).

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Of the rarely examined individual differences which may have a considerable influence on spontaneous speech production (Carrell, Prince & Astika, 1996) is the type of personality. Furnham (1990) even describes the existing literature on the relationship between personality/cognitive style and language measures as unsatisfactory and frustrating because of the absence of

> parsimonious, consistent, fruitful theories described specifically for, or derived from, the personality markers of speech (. . .) the `theories' that do exist are frequently at an inappropriate level-too molecular in that they deal specifically with the relationship between a restricted number of selected variables or too molar in the sense that by being over-inclusive they are either unverifiable or unfruitful in the extent to which they generate testable hypotheses (p. 92).

Furnham (1990) also argues that personality theorists do not consider speech production interesting enough to warrant an in-depth investigation. Besides, finding the appropriate level for analysis is problematic. Theoreticians in the field of personality research incline to explain linguistic behavior at a global level and do not wish to analyze linguistic subsystems in detail. Psycholinguists and sociolinguists, on the other hand, get confused by the multiplicity of theories in the field of personality research and seem uncertain of which traits and at which level (super or primary-traits) to measure the linguistic ability.

One seriously flawed study by Naiman, Frohlich, Stern and Todesco (1978) on personality variables and language learning, where extraversion personality type scores were found not to correlate with language test results, was quoted for two decades but never challenged in applied

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

linguistic studies. This negative publicity for trait extraversion was so strong that researchers seemed to believe that no significant link could be expected between extraversion and any linguistic measure. But, Dewaele and Furnham (1999) suggest that if Naiman et al. (1978) had used a wider variety of more sophisticated linguistic variables, covering not only written language but also natural communicative oral language, they might have found that the construct validity of the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) was not to be blamed for the lack of expected correlations.

For Furnham (1990), studies on language and aggression, as a personality type, are even fewer in number. They have also been performed by researchers working in different disciplines (educational psychology, personality psychology, applied linguistics) with different methodologies and expectations and hence are difficult to compare (Muniz-Fernandez & Granizo, 1981).

Several psychological studies have indicated that aggressives take more time than non- aggressives to retrieve information from long-term or permanent memory. One possible reason for this difference, according to Eysenck (1981), could be the overarousal of the aggressives which would affect their parallel processing. Aggressives also tend to be more socially anxious (Cheek & Buss, 1981). This high anxiety, in turn, leads to increased attentional selectivity and reduced attentional capacity (Fremont, Means & Means, 1976; Eysenck, 1981). Eysenck (ibid) also argues that the higher anxiety of the aggressives could further reduce the available processing capacity of working memory, which "would explain why aggressives take longer to access information (. . .) from long-term memory or permanent storage" (1981, p. 203).

Eysenck (1979) reconceptualizes anxiety in terms of cognitive interference, as well. He suggests that anxious people divide their attention

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

between task-related cognition and self-related cognition, making cognitive performance less efficient. The anxious person, hence, tries to compensate for the reduced efficiency by increased effort. MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) who believe that Eysenck's theory "is able to explain the negative effects observed for language anxiety" (p. 285), found that language anxiety "tends to correlate with measures of performance in the second language but not in the native language" (p. 301). They concluded that the "potential effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language may be pervasive and may be quite subtle" (p. 301). Pursuing this line of research, MacIntyre and Charos (1996) used path analysis to investigate the role of global personality traits on self-reported frequency of communication in a second language. They found that aggressives are less willing to communicate in French as their second language than non-aggressives.

Doing research on aggression and language learning, another issue to be dealt with is distinguishing between aggression and assertiveness. Addressing this issue is not usually a simple task, and for many people being assertive is just the same as being aggressive. Aggression, however, involves actions meant to harm others. The actions must by definition be intentional, and they must be meant to harm. Assertiveness, on the other hand, means expressing one's own needs and feelings, defending one's rights while respecting the rights and feelings of others.

Aggressive Communication and Predispositions

Those who study human communication behaviors understand aggressive communication by a few specific behaviors. Aggressive communication involves one person exerting force on another, typically with a high level of arousal. Participants engaged in aggressive communication are usually more active than passive, and they often adopt "attack" and "defend" modes of thinking and action. These types of behavior are essential for successfully

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

resolving a conflict, though they can be used destructively as well as constructively. Four predispositions that interact with environmental factors and are classified as either constructive or destructive are believed to influence an individual's approach to conflict resolution (Williams, 2000):

Constructive predispositions: Assertiveness and argumentativeness are viewed as constructive predispositions of aggressiveness. Assertiveness includes characteristics of personal dominance, firmness, forcefulness, and the use of assertive behavior to achieve personal goals. Argumentativeness involves the use of reasoning to defend personal positions on controversial issues while attacking the positions of adversaries. Argumentativeness can be understood as a subset of assertiveness; all argument is assertive, but not all assertiveness involves argument (e.g., a request). The communication discipline advocates the development of these two constructive traits in individuals. Time after time, research has shown that individuals who approach conflict from an argumentative stance are seen as more credible, eloquent, creative, and self-assured and are more likely to be viewed as leaders (Williams, 2000).

Destructive predispositions: Hostility and verbal aggressiveness are regarded as destructive predispositions. Hostility is characterized by the expression of negativity, resentment, and suspicion. Verbal aggressiveness is an assault on the self-concept, rather than the position, of an adversary. Individuals typically engage in verbal aggression in order to inflict psychological pain, such as humiliation, embarrassment, and other negative feelings about the self. Compared with argumentative individuals, those who are verbally aggressive are seen as less credible, tend to suffer more from strained relations with others, and resort to physical aggression and interpersonal violence more often (Williams, 2000).

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Causes of Verbal Aggressiveness

Research has suggested a number of factors that may lead to a predisposition for verbal aggressiveness. One of the factors is repressed hostility. Individuals who were emotionally scarred by verbal aggression and hostility at a young age tend to demonstrate similar behaviors later in life. Because they were too young or lacked the power to reciprocate, they suppressed the hostility and have come to verbally aggress against those who remind them of the original source of hurt.

Social learning is also responsible for much verbal aggression. We learn to be verbally aggressive from various environmental forces, including our culture, social group, family, friends, and the mass media. People reared in an environment of verbal aggression are more likely to exhibit this type of communication behavior.

Disdain is another common cause of verbal aggression. If we severely dislike someone, we are more likely to verbally aggress against him or her. While we generally try to ignore those we disdain, unavoidable (or even intentional) confrontations with them can rouse the ugliest verbal aggression in us.

Finally, many people resort to verbal aggression in order to compensate for a deficiency in argumentative skills. During conflict episodes, these individuals quickly use up their weak arguments only to find that their position is still not accepted. Because they find themselves in the "attack" and "defend" modes, they feel forced to use verbal aggression as a last resort (Williams, 2000).

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Types of Verbal Aggression

Taxonomy of verbally aggressive messages includes character and competence attacks, disconfirmation, physical appearance attacks, racial epithets, teasing, ridicule, threats, cursing, negative comparisons, and nonverbal aggression (e.g., rolling the eyes, gritting the teeth, looks of disdain, and "flipping the bird"). All of these types of aggression are considered attacks on an adversary's self-concept and contribute little to nothing to the resolution of conflict. Often, in fact, they escalate the conflict, sometimes to the point of physical violence (Piko &Kereztes, 2006).

Aggression and Language Learning

Quite a lot of research effort has been devoted to elucidating what kind of learning characteristics do appear to be related to success in learning languages and in what way they are related (Mc Donough, 1995). If these research efforts do reach conclusions on the existence of individual student characteristics that are favorably related to language learning, the language teacher needs to know how this knowledge can be used (ibid). Language practitioners should be aware of the studies done on personality factors if they are to apply theories of foreign/ second language learning in their classrooms. If they base their theories and methods just on cognitive factors, they are more likely to put aside the most important side of human behavior (Crozier, 1997). Hilgard (1963) well known for his study of human cognition and learning notes: "purely cognitive theories of learning will be rejected unless a role is assigned to affectivity which is the personality factors within a person that contribute in some way to the success of language learning"(p.267).

Each of the personality factors has particular effects on the process of language learning and teaching. Some of them may hinder the learner from learning or they may cause problems for the learners and language teachers (Crozier, 1997), and some may facilitate the process. In this regard and as

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

mentioned before, *aggression* as one of the most important and least studied personality traits – compared to other personality factors- can be considered as one of the determining factors in EFL learner's ability in oral proficiency and investigating the relationship between these two important constructs is supposed to be significant. Another significance of the study lies in the fact that as far as the researchers know, few studies and works have been done on *aggression* in education in general and in the area of foreign/ second language learning in particular. So, it is hoped that this study would assist language teachers and those involved in language teaching and learning to develop more efficient training programs, materials, procedures and methods that are best suited the special personality traits of their students.

Methodology

Participants

The participants of this study were 100 female EFL learners, majoring in English literature at Lorestan University, Khorram-abad, Iran. In order to classify them in almost homogenized groups and screen the required number of the subjects, they were given a TOEFL test of language proficiency. Then, those who scored one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected for the main part of the study and interviews. Doing so, 73 students remained as the main subjects of the study out of which two did not appear for the interviews. So the total number of the subjects of this study was 71.

Instrumentation

The following instruments were used to screen the participants and gather the data:

1- The aggression questionnaire developed by Buss & Perry (1992). The original version of the questionnaire has 29 multiple choice items with high indexes of reliability and validity. It is designed to measure the different dimensions of the hostility/anger/aggression construct. It consists

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

of 4 subscales that assess: (a) anger, (b) hostility, (c) verbal aggression, and (d) physical aggression.

The present researchers translated the questionnaire into Persian and validated it in a pilot study with 206 participants. The reliability of the Persian version of Aggression Questionnaire was tested once considering the whole questionnaire and once for each subscale, using Cronbach's Alpha. The alpha reliability was found to be .85 for the whole questionnaire and reliability of each subscale was as follows:

Anger (seven items): .65.
Physical Aggression (nine items): .74
Verbal Aggression (five items): .59
Hostility (eight items): .69

To confirm the factor structure of the Persian version of "Aggression Questionnaire", all the 29 items of the scale were factor-analyzed using Principal Component Analysis and only four components were extracted from the data which account most for the total variance of the data.

2- A retired version of TOEFL (1995) which included 100 multiple choice items and two sections: Structure, Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension.

3- In order to check the participants' oral proficiency, an IELTS test of oral proficiency was administered. This test consists of three parts (introduction, one- way task cards and extended two way discussions) that in its original version lasts about 10-12 minutes but it lasted between 14-17 minutes in this study.

Procedure

The participants were all interviewed and asked to fill the validated Persian version of the aggression questionnaire. All the interviews were tape-recorded and rated by two raters. Inter-rater reliability was estimated adopting Pearson correlation (Table 1).

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Table 1
Correlation between the scores of two raters

		Rater 1	Rater 2
Rater 1	Pearson Correlation	1	.665**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	71	71
Rater 2	Pearson Correlation	**.665****	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	71	71

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Based on their scores on aggression questionnaire, the subjects were then divided into two groups of aggressives and non-aggressives, and the mean of their scores in oral interviews was compared using t-test. Finally, in order to see exactly what the nature of the relationship between the two variables, i.e. aggression and oral proficiency, is, the correlation between them was estimated and the correlation between four subscales of aggression and all the components of oral proficiency were also estimated.

Results

Mean scores obtained from the oral proficiency tests (interviews) of the aggressive and non-aggressive participants are presented in Table 2. It seems that non-aggressive group with a mean score of 16.79 did slightly better than the aggressive ones.

Table 2
Comparison between the mean scores of the aggressive and non-aggressive groups*:*
Group statistics

Degrees		**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**Std. Error Mean**
Score	**Agg.**	31	13.55	2.767	.497
	Nonagg.	29	16.79	2.128	.395

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

In order to investigate any possible significant relationship between the two groups, a t-test was run. As Table 3 indicates (p-value< .05), we can safely claim that aggressive and non aggressive groups are different in their oral proficiency and this personality trait has a significant effect on the oral proficiency of the L2 learners.

Table 3
T- test results of the comparison between aggressive and non-aggressive groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		**t-test for Equality of Means**						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. 2-tailed	Mean difference	Std. error difference	95% Confidence Interval of the difference	
								lower	upper
ORAPRO Equal variances assumed	1.34	.26	-3.42	20	.003	-3.454	1.0099	-5.561	-1.348
Equal variance not assumed			-3.42	16.8	.003	-3.454	1.0099	-5.587	-1.322

Table 4
Correlations between aggression and oral proficiency

		Total score	**TOTALAGG**
Total score	Pearson Correlation	1	-.520**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	71	71
Total agg.	Pearson Correlation	**-.520****	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	71	71

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

As reported in Table 4, the correlation coefficient between oral proficiency score and score on aggression is -.52, which is significant at .01 level. This shows that aggression negatively affects oral proficiency, i.e., any increase in aggression leads to decrease in the participants' oral proficiency. The detailed analyses also revealed that *verbal aggression* and *anger* have the most negative effect on the components of oral proficiency.

As Tables 5 and 6 depict, the correlation coefficients (Pearson Correlation) between verbal aggression and fluency, comprehensibility, and vocabulary are -.49, -.34 (significant at .01 level) and -.25 (significant at .05 level) respectively. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient between anger and fluency (-.43), anger and pronunciation (-.50) and anger and accuracy (-.34) are all significant at 0.01 level.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Table 5
Correlations between subscales of aggression questionnaire and components of oral proficiency test

	Fluen.	Pronu.	Accu.	Voc.	Comp.	total score	PA	VA	A	H	Total agg.
Fluency Corr.	1	.41**	.46**	.29*	.33**	.73**	-.24*	-.48**	-.43**	-.47**	-.64**
Sig. •	.	.00	.00	.014	.005	.00	.04	.00	.00	.00	.00
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
pronun Corr.	.41**	1	.58**	.43**	.16	.72**	-.08	-.19	-.50**	-.17	-.35**
Sig.	.00	.	.00	.00	.159	.00	.463	.11	.00	.154	.002
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
Accura. Corr.	.46**	.58**	1	.30**	.19	.72**	.08	-.21	-.34**	-.1	-.22
Sig.	.00	.00	.	.01	.10	.00	.483	.067	.003	.407	.065
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
Voc. Corr.	.29*	.43**	.30**	1	.46**	.71**	-.09	-.25*	-.28*	-.01	-.24*
Sig.	.014	.00	.01	.	.00	.00	.450	.035	.014	.921	.037
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
Compre Corr.	.33**	.16	.19	.46**	1	.57**	-.27*	-.33**	-.26*	-.09	-.36**
Sig.	.005	.159	.10	.00	.	.00	.021	.004	.029	.427	.002
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
Total Score. Corr	.73**	.72**	.72**	.71**	.57**	1	-.16	-.42**	-.51**	-.26*	-.52**
Sig.	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.	.183	.00	.00	.027	.00
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
PA Corr.	-.24*	-.08	.08	-.09	-.27*	-.16	1	.32**	-.003	-.04	.41**
Sig.	.040	.463	.483	.450	.021	.183	.	.006	.981	.704	.00
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
VA Corr.	-.48**	-.19	-.21	-.25*	-.33**	-.42**	.32**	1	.43**	.27*	.75**
Sig.	.00	.11	.067	.035	.004	.000	.006	.	.00	.021	.00
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
A Corr.	-.43**	-.50**	-.34**	-.28*	-.26*	-.51**	-.003**	.43**	1	.50**	.75**
Sig.	.00	.00	.003	.014	.029	.00	.961	.00	.	.00	.00
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
H Corr.	-.47**	-.17	-.10	-.01	-.09	-.26*	-.04	.27*	.50**	1	.70**
Sig.	.00	.154	.407	.921	.427	.027	.704	.021	.00	.	.00
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71
TOTAL AGG Corr.	-.64**	-.35**	-.22	-.24*	-.36**	-.52**	.41**	.75**	.75**	.70**	1
Sig.	.00	.002	.065	.037	.002	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.
N	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71

• All significances: Significance 2-tailed

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Table 6
Correlations between verbal aggression and anger and the components of oral proficiency test

	fluency	pronunciation	accuracy	vocabulary	comprehensibility	Total
verbal aggression	-.49**	-.19	-.22	-.25*	-.34**	-.42**
anger	-.43**	-.51**	-.35**	-.29*	-.26*	-.51**

Discussion

According to the findings reported in the previous sections, we can positively claim that verbal aggression and anger are the most influential subscales of aggression affecting oral proficiency negatively although hostility had a significant negative correlation with fluency, as well. These findings are consistent with the findings of studies done by Macintyre & Gardner (1994), who found that aggressive individuals are more likely to have problems in the area of language and that aggressive individuals consistently score low in both receptive and expressive language. Moreover, as mentioned before, several psychological studies have indicated that aggresssives take longer than non-aggressives to retrieve information from long-term memory (Eysenck, 1981). This very fact may be one of the reasons behind the negative correlations found in the present research.

In fact, the findings show that aggressive individuals, verbally aggressive ones in particular, have problems in the area of language production and specifically in their oral proficiencies. The results are in line with both Brinkley, Bernstein, and Newman (1999) who state that aggressive individuals lack coherence and planning in the expression of language and Villemarette-Pittman et al (2002) who assert that aggressive individuals exhibit poor organization and planning of complex verbal

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

output, have reduced perceptual accuracy of complex visual stimuli, and suffer from a general reduction in "well-formedness" of speech.

Recent studies using clinic and forensic samples have reported language impairment (LI) in populations with conduct problems or other forms of antisocial behavior like aggression. For instance, in a psychiatric clinic sample of 7- to 14-year-olds, two-thirds of children diagnosed with conduct disorder were language impaired (Cohen, Menna, et al., 1998). Further, a high percentage of adolescents in residential treatment for conduct problems or externalizing behavior have been diagnosed with language impairment (Giddan, Milling, & Campbell, 1996; Warr-Leaper, Wright, & Mack, 1994). In addition, incarcerated adolescent boys have displayed language deficits in comparison with controls (Davis, Sanger, & Morris-Friehe, 1991).

Results of Boone's study (1975) also can be said to support the Language Aggression Hypothesis. This hypothesis suggests that measurable high language proficiency is associated with low observable aggression and low language proficiency is associated with high observable aggression.

Araujo Dawson and William (2008) also examined the relationship between limited English proficiency status, and internalizing and externalizing behaviors among a sample of Latino children (N = 2,840) from the US Department of Education's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Kindergarten (ECLS-K) data set. Results of cross sectional regression and hierarchical linear modeling analyses suggest that there is a positive relationship between limited English proficiency and externalizing symptoms, particularly by third grade.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Comparing the results obtained from the examination of the oral language behavior of our Iranian L2 learners and those of other studies in other parts of the world reported above, we believe that there is not considerable differences between Iranian and non-Iranian aggressive and non-aggressive L2 learners.

Another point drawn from the results of this study is the significance influence of verbal aggression and anger on most of the components of oral proficiency. This issue was rarely examined in previous researches.

Of various possible implications of the findings of this study, one is directly related to language teachers. As aggressive people cannot express themselves in stressful situations, the teacher can create a stress-free and friendly classroom atmosphere in which the learners are encouraged to participate in life-like, authentic and meaningful communication. The creation of such an atmosphere can be attained through classifying students into groups whose members are comfortable with one another and can express themselves openly.

Another implication of the study concerns the speaking skill and the ability of the students to engage in oral communication. Since learning to speak is one of the main goals of many language programs, the smart teacher can observe his/her students in conversational classes and note their weaknesses in oral interpersonal communication. The language teacher can reflect on the reasons why a student is unable to convince his/her interlocutor. Is it mainly due to the personality of the student or are there some other reasons involved? There are but some of the questions and points which can be of a great help in guiding the language teacher to come to a fuller understanding of the problems existing in many language classes.

Received 2 August, 2007
Accepted 23 March 2008

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

References

Araujo Dawson, B., & Williams, S. A. (2008). The impact of language status as an acculturative stressor on internalizing and externalizing behavior among Latino/Hispanic youth: A longitudinal analysis from school entry through third grade. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37 (4), 399-411.

Bahri, H. (2003). *The Relationship Between Teaching Style and Personality Types of Iranian TEFL Teachers.* Unpublished MA thesis, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran.

Boone, S. L. (1975). Language, Cognition, and Social Factors in the Regulation of Aggressive Behavior: A Study of Black, Puerto Rican, and White Children. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Volume: 36-07, Section: A, page: 4338.

Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 63, 452-459.

Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1981). Shyness and sociability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(2), 330- 339.

Carrell, P. L., Prince, M. S., & Astika, G. G. (1996). Personality types and language learning in an EFL context. *Language Learning*, 46(1), 75-99.

Cohen, N. J., Menna, R., Vallance, D. D., Barwick, M., Im, N., & Horodezky, N. B. (1998). Language, social cognitive processing, and behavioral characteristics of psychiatrically disturbed children with

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

previously identified and unsuspected language impairments. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 39*,* 853–864.

Crozier, W. R. (1997). *Individual Learners: personality differences in education*. London.

Davis, A. D., Sanger,D. D., & Morris-Friehe, M. (1991). Language skills of delinquent and non-delinquent males. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 24(4), 251–266.

Dewaele, J. M., Furnham, A. (1999). Extraversion: the unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning*, 49(3), 509-544.

Eysenck, H. J. (1979). *The structure and measurement of intelligence*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Eysenck, M. W. (1981). Learning, memory and personality. In H. J. Eysenck (Eds.), *A model for personality* (pp 169- 209). Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Furnham, A. (1990). Language and personality. In H. Giles., & W. P. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social psychology* (pp. 73-59). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Giddan, J. J., Milling, L., & Campbell, N. B. (1996). Unrecognized language and speech deficits in preadolescent psychiatric inpatients. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 66, 85–92.

Harrison, S. (2004). *Aggression Versus Assertiveness. Encouraging and developing business excellence*. Auckland: Otahuhu.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

Hilgard, E. (1963). *Motivation in learning theory*. New York: Halt, Reinhart, and Winston.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15(1), 3- 26.

MacIntyre, P., & Gardner, R. (1994). The subtle effect of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283- 305.

Mc Donough, S. (1995). *Strategy and Skills in learning a foreign language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Muniz- Fernandez, J., & Granizo, M. (1981). Extraversion- introversion and neuroticism- control. *Journal of experimental psychology*, 36(4), 627-650.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Villemarette- Pittman, N., Stanford, M. (2002). Language and executive function in self-reported impulsive aggression. *Personality and individual difference*s, 34(8), 1533-1544.

Warr-Leaper, G., Wright, N. A., & Mack, A. (1994). Language disabilities of antisocial boys in residential treatment. *Behavioral Disorders*, 19, 159–169.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

APPENDIX
A: Aggressive Questionnaire (Persian)

پرسشنامه پرخاشگری

جنسیت:
سن:

مقیاس چهار گزینه ای زیر نشان میدهد که کدام عبارت در مورد شما صدق میکند.

1= اصلا در مورد من صدق نمی کند.
2= تا حدی در مورد من صدق نمی کند.
3= تا حدی در مورد من صدق می کند.
4= کاملا مورد من صدق می کند.

1- برخی از دوستانم فکر می کنند که من فرد عجولی هستم.

1	2	3	4

2- اگر مجبور شوم برای حفظ حقوقم به خشونت متوسل میشوم.

1	2	3	4

3- زمانی که دوستانم به طور خاصی با من مهربان هستند از خودم می پرسم که از من چه میخواهند.

1	2	3	4

4- وقتی که با دوستانم مخالف باشم بی پرده به آنها می گویم.

1	2	3	4

5- بعضی وقتها آنقدر عصبانی شده ام که اشیای اطرافم را شکسته ام.

1	2	3	4

6- وقتی دیگران با من مخالفت می کنند نمی توانم از جر و بحث با آنها بپر هیزم.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

1	2	3	4

7- تعجب می کنم که چرا گاهی اوقات اینقدر احساس نا خوشایندی نسبت به مسایل اطرافم دارم.

1	2	3	4

8- هر از گاهی نمی توانم میلم را برای زدن دیگران کنترل کنم.

1	2	3	4

9- من فردی آرام هستم.

1	2	3	4

10- من به غریبه هایی که بیش از حد ابراز دوستی میکنند مظنون می شوم.

1	2	3	4

11- من افراد دور و برم را گاه تهدید کرده ام.

1	2	3	4

12- من زود عصبانی می شوم و زود هم بر عصبانیتم غلبه میکنم.

1	2	3	4

13- اگر به اندازه کافی تحریک شوم امکان دارد به دیگران حمله کنم.

1	2	3	4

14- وقتی دیگران مرا می رنجانند به آنها می گویم که در باره شان چطور فکر می کنم.

1	2	3	4

15- گاهی اوقات از فرط حسادت منفجر می شوم.

1	2	3	4

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

16- هیچ وقت دلیلی برای زدن دیگران نمی بینم.

1	2	3	4

17- گاهی اوقات احساس می کنم که سهم من از زندگی نا عادلانه است.

1	2	3	4

18- به سختی میتوانم عصبانیتم را کنترل کنم.

1	2	3	4

19- موقعی که سر خورده میشوم ناراحتیم را نشان می دهم.

1	2	3	4

20- گاهی اوقات حس می کنم دیگران پشت سرم به من می خندند.

1	2	3	4

21- من اغلب خود را در حال مخالفت با دیگران می بینم.

1	2	3	4

22- اگر کسی به من ضربه ای(فیزیکی) بزند من هم مقابله به مثل می کنم.

1	2	3	4

23- گاهی اوقات احساس می کنم مثل یک انبار باروت آماده انفجار هستم.

1	2	3	4

24- به نظر میرسد که همیشه دیگرانند که اول ارتباطشان را با من فطع می کنند.

1	2	3	4

25- رفتار بعضی افراد مرا وادار می کند که به آنها وارد درگیری شوم.

1	2	3	4

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

26- می دانم که دوستانم پشت سرم صحبت می کنند.

1	2	3	4

27- دوستانم می گویند که من تا حدی اهل جر و بحث هستم.

1	2	3	4

28- گاهی اوقات بی دلیل از کوره در میروم.

1	2	3	4

29- کمی بیشتر از یک فرد معمولی وارد درگیریها میشوم.

1	2	3	4

B: Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992)

Instructions:
Using the 5 point scale shown below, indicate how uncharacteristic or characteristic each of the following statements is in describing you. Place your rating in the box to the right of the statement.
1 = extremely uncharacteristic of me
2 = somewhat uncharacteristic of me
3 = neither uncharacteristic nor characteristic of me
4 = somewhat characteristic of me
5 = extremely characteristic of me

1- Some of my friends think that I am a hot head.

2- If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights, I will.

3- When people are especially nice to me, I wonder what they want.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

4- I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them.

5- I have become so mad that I have broken things.

6- I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.

7- I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.

8- Once in a while, I can't control the urge to strike another person.

9- I'm an even- tempered person.

10- I'm suspicious to overly friendly strangers.

11- I have threatened people I know.

12- I flare up quickly but get over it quickly.

13- Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.

14- When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.

15- I'm some times eaten up with jealousy.

16- I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person.

17- At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life.

18- I have trouble controlling my temper.

19- When frustrated, I let my irritation show.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]

20- I some times feel that people are laughing at me behind my back.

21- I often find myself disagreeing with people.

22- If some body hits me, I hit back.

23- I some times feel like a powder keg ready to explode.

24- Other people always seem to get the breaks.

25- There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.

26- I know that "friends" talk about me behind my back.

27- My friends say that I'm sometimes argumentative.

28- Some times I fly off the handles for no good reason.

29- I get into fights a little more than the average person.

Scoring

The two questions with the asterisk are reverse scored.

The Aggression scale consists of 4 factors, Physical Aggression (PA), Verbal Aggression (VA), Anger (A) and Hostility (H). The total score for Aggression is the sum of the factor scores.

[Downloaded from ndea10.khu.ac.ir on 2026-11-06]