



The relationship between the extraversion trait and use of the English language learning strategies

Seyed Hossein Fazeli

Department of English Language Teaching, Abadan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadan, Iran
fazeli78@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present study aims to find out the relationship between the Extraversion trait and use of the English Language Learning Strategies (ELLSs) for learners of English as a foreign language. Four instruments were used, which were Persian adapted Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), a Background Questionnaire, NEO-Five Factors Inventory (NEO-FFI), and Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Two hundred and thirteen Iranian female university level learners of English language as a university major in Iran were the volunteer to participate in this research work. The intact classes were chosen. The results show that there is a significant relationship between the Extraversion trait and use of the each of three of the six categories of ELLSs (*i.e.*, Memory Strategies, Meta-cognitive Strategies, and Social Strategies).

Keywords. Language learning strategies, English learning, Extraversion trait.

Introduction

Research on the related literature of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) shows that the LLSs has a history of only thirty years that is much sporadic (Chamot, 2005). Recently such strategies have been the focus of specific research (Oxford, 1990), and much of the research was descriptive. Such studies show that in order to affect changes in perceptions of the learners' role in learning process; we need to discover more about what learners do to learn languages successfully.

LLSs have potential to be "an extremely powerful learning tool" (O'Malley *et al.*, 1985) and in junction with other techniques may well prove to be an extremely a useful tool for learners' language learning (Griffiths, 2004). Moreover, use of LLSs help learners store and retrieve material, and facilitate their learning, and the frequency and range of strategy use is the main difference between effective learners and less effective learners (Chamat *et al.*, 1999).

Marti'nez (1996) discusses some features of LLSs that are inferred from the literature. They play important role to facilitate language learning; Learners may use LLSs as problem-solving mechanisms to deal with the process of second/foreign language learning. In addition, Oxford (1990) discusses that there are some other features for LLSs such as "problem orientation, ability to support learning directly or indirectly" (p.11).

Since 1990s, there has been a growing interest on how personality correlates to the academic performance. In such case, it was shown that successful language learners choose strategies suit to their personalities (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989), and since LLSs are not innate but learnable (Oxford, 1994), there are broad justifications have been offered for the evaluation of personality traits as the predictors of LLSs. For instance, behavior tendencies reflected in personality traits affect some habits, which influence LLSs (Paunonen & O'Connor, 2007).

The past studies regarding the relationship between personality and LLSs have contributed to a voluminous archive of evidence pointing to conclusion that to understand scientifically, it must be interesting in personality (Cook, 2008). In such case, so high progress has been made toward a consensus on personality structure (John, 1990; Costa & McCare, 1992; McCare & John, 1992). For example, Reiss (1983) found there was a significant correlation between successful language learning and the extraversion trait; Ehrman and Oxford (1990) argue that since extroverted students like to interact with others, they learn foreign language better; it was found that there was a correlation between extraversion and certain linguistic measures (Dewaele & Furnham, 1999), and Shokri *et al.* (2007) proved that the extraversion trait had a significant positive relationship with surface learning. Moreover, there were found mix results. For example, Kiany (1998) found that two studies showed a positive relationship between the extraversion trait and L2 success, three studies had a positive relationship between the introversion trait and L2 success, and three studies did not indicate any relationship. Alternatively, Robinson, *et al.* (1994) found there was a positive significant correlation between the extraversion trait and achievement of language learning, but Skehan (1989) proved that there was not any relationship.

Literature search reveals that the researchers researched on extraversion and introversion more than other personality traits (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996), and the conclusions regarding the studies of extraversion and introversion varied from each other and they are inconsistent (Busch, 1982; MacIntyer & Charos, 1996).

The relationship between Language Learning Strategies and Personality Traits

Up to 1970's, language learning was studies merely based on linguistics subfields such as syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Since 1970's psycholinguists started to study individuals' linguistic development based on their



psychological development. Such studies came as psycholinguistics theories in the studies of different researchers such as Brown (1973) and Smart (1970). In this way, research on LLSs has been inspired by two closely interwoven disciplines: cognitive psychology and second language acquisition.

There is a general belief that the relationship between personality and second language acquisition is as a two-way process which they modify each other (Ellis, 1985), and there are enough evidences that show personality factors can facilitate acquisition of second language (Reiss, 1983; Strong, 1983; Ely, 1986). In addition, since there is a strong relationship between psychological traits and the way that learners use language strategies (Ehraman & Oxford, 1990), psychological traits can play the most important role in the field of LLSs. In such situation, Reiss (1983) found there was a significant correlation between successful language learning and the conscientiousness trait. At last but not least, a review of the relevant literature shows that personality traits significantly influence success in learning a second language (Gass & Selinker, 1994) and personality factors are important in development of linguistic abilities (Ellis, 1985).

Methodology

Participants

The descriptive statistics are such type of numerical representation of participants (Brown, 1996). The sample drawn from the population must be representative so as to allow the researchers to make inferences or generalization from sample statistics to population (Maleske, 1995). As Riazi (1999) presents "A question that often plagues the novice the researcher is just how large his sample should be in order to conduct an adequate survey or study. There is, of course, no clear-cut answer" (pp.242-243). If sample size is too small, it is difficult to have a reliable answer to the research questions. If sample is too large, it is difficulty of doing research. To leave a margin of about 20% for ineffectual questionnaires slightly bigger numbers were chosen. In this way, initially a total of two hundred and fifty Iranian female university level learners of English language as a university major at the Islamic Azad University Branches of three cities which named Abadan, Dezful and Masjed-Solyman in Khuzestan province in south of Iran, were asked to participate in this research work. It must bear in mind that number of participants may affect the appropriateness of particular tool (Cohen & Scott, 1996). The intact classes were chosen.

The chosen participants for this study were female students studying in third grade (year) of English major of B.A. degree, ranging age from 19 to 28 (Mean=23.4, SD=2). Their mother tongue was Persian (Farsi) which is the official language of Iran, according to Act 15 of the Iranian constitution.

The socio-economic status of participants, such as the participants' social background, and parents' level

education was controlled as well by a questionnaire, based on some indicators such as the parents' socio-educational background and occupation; the participants were matched as closely as possible for socio-economic background to minimize the effect of social class. Accordingly, the participants were classified as a middle class. Moreover the most of the participants from the Islamic Azad University in Khuzestan province, Iran, have middle-class and similar socio-economic background.

Because of the nature of this work (regarding use of the ELLSs), a general English proficiency test for determining the proficiency level of participants in English was applied in order to minimize the effect of English language proficiency. As Jafarpour (2001) defines "the percent classification of subjects by the experimental test that corresponds to those by the criterion" (pp.32-33) (as cited in Golkar & Yamini, 2007), top of subjects are 27% and bottom of subjects are 27% (Golkar & Yamini, 2007), the participant whom were classified as intermediate subjects, were asked to participate in the current study.

Instrumentation in the current study

Four instruments were used to gather data in the current study. They were:

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL): As Gould (1981) presents "Taxonomy is always a contentious issue because the world does not come to use in neat little packages" (p.158), and there is not a logical and well-accepted system for describing of strategy (Oxford, 1994). In this way, finding a particular classification of LLSs as a universal basic classification that can be as a LLSs' universal classification system, what everybody agrees upon is impossible. However, from point of view of extensive review of the literature, Oxford (1990) gathered extensive literature on LLSs.

There are many significant differences between the Oxford's taxonomy and the other ones. For example, firstly, Oxford classifies heterogeneous strategies into more specific categories (Ehrman, Leaver & Oxford, 2003); secondly, according to O'Malley & Chamot (1990), the Oxford's strategy classification is an inclusion of every strategy that has up to then been cited in the learning literature; and thirdly, the Oxford's taxonomy links individual strategies and groups of strategies with each of the four language skills (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). In this way, Griffiths (2004) suggests the Oxford' classification system of LLSs can be as a useful base for understanding LLSs.

The Oxford's taxonomy includes Memory Strategies, Cognitive Strategies, Compensation Strategies, Metacognitive Strategies, Affective Strategies, and Social Strategies.

Based on the Oxford's classification, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, version 7.0) was developed. The SILL is a kind of self-report questionnaire that has been used extensively by the researchers in many countries, and its reliability has been checked in



multiple ways, and has been reported as high validity, reliability and utility (Oxford, 1996).

The SILL is a structured survey (Oxford, 1990), which according to Oxford and Nyikos (1989) the strategies which were included in the SILL were gathered from extensive literature review. In addition, Oxford (1996) claims in general, the SILL reliability has been high, and the reliability remains "very acceptable" (Oxford & Bury-Stock, 1995). Moreover, Green & Oxford (1995) claim that reliability using Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.93 to 0.95 depending whether the survey is taken in learner's own language or in target language. In addition, the SILL has used with learners whose native languages were different languages such as Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Spanish, Thai, and Turkish (Oxford, 1990). In addition, its reliability reported in many studies as high reliability in translated version of different languages (Grainger, 1997; Griffiths, 2002; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Park, 1997; Sharp, 2008; Szu-Hsin *et al.*, 2006; Yang, 2007).

Regarding the validity of SILL, the Oxford and Bury-Stock (1995) claims that the all types of validity are very high. Moreover, factor analysis of the SILL is confirmed by many studies (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002; Oxford, 1996; Oxford & Bury-Stock, 1995). In this way, as Ellis (1994) believes the Oxford's taxonomy is possibly the most comprehensive currently available. Several empirical studies have been found moderate inter-correlation between the items of six categories in the SILL (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995).

The original SILL includes 50 items, but the adapted version includes 49 items that adapted for the current study. In adapted version of the SILL, one item was taken out. The item was deleted based on the feedback from participants in the pilot study. Revision in part of Cognitive Strategies includes deletion of item number 22 "I try not to translate word for word". The possible reason why the item 22 affects the reliability of the SILL can be the suggestion of the most teachers to "avoid translation word for word".

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL): TOEFL (Structure and Written Expression, and Reading Comprehension parts) as a general English proficiency test was used.

A background questionnaire: The socio-economic status of participants was controlled as well by a background questionnaire.

NEO-Five Factors Inventory (NEO-FFI): The evidences indicate that five factors of personality is fairly stable over time (Costa & McCare, 1988; Digman, 1989). In addition, factor structures resembling such factors of personality were identified in numerous sets of variables (Digman & Inouye, 1986; Goldberg, 1981, 1990; John, 1990; McCare & Costa, 1985; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996). Based on such five factors, the NEO-FFI was developed. It is a self-scoring, and paper and pencil survey.

The short form of the NEO-FFI (Costa & McCare, 1992) was translated into Persian language (Fathi-Ashtiani, 2009) with some adaptations was used in the current study. It is consist of sixty items, 12 items for each of the "Big Five" sub-scales.

The Extraversion trait is one of the five traits that are assessed through the NEO-FFI. The Extraversion trait represents the tendency to be sociable and assertive, cheerful, active, upbeat, and optimistic, assertiveness, and positive emotionality. Moreover, "Extraversion implies an energetic approach toward the social and material world" (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Sample of the pilot study

The sample for the pilot study, as "A small-scale replica and a rehearsal of the main study" (Riazi, 1999), was selected so as it represents the entire sample for participants whom asked to participate in the main study. Since sample size in pilot study ranges from 20 to bigger of 65 (Hinkin, 1998), thirty nine female students university level learners of English language as a university major at Islamic Azad University Branches of three cities which named Abadan, Dezful, and Masjed-Solyman were asked to participate in the pilot study.

Reliability of the instruments

This section will explore the reliability of the four instruments: the SILL, the NEO-FFI, and the Openness to Experiences trait as a sub-scale of NEO-FFI, and TOEFL. Since Cronbach's alpha is one of the standard ways of expressing a test's reliability (Foster, 1998); and its coefficient is commonly used to describe the reliability factors of multi-point formatted questionnaires or scales; in such way, the reliability of our experimental measures were assessed by calculating Cronbach's alpha over the items of the four instruments across all the participants in the current study which were found 0.89 for the SILL (Cronbach's alpha were 0.73 for Memory Strategies, 0.71 for Cognitive Strategies, 0.72 for Compensation Strategies, 0.81 for Meta-cognitive Strategies, 0.71 for Affective Strategies, and 0.73 for Social Strategies), 0.82 for the NEO-FFI, 0.69 for the Extraversion trait, and 0.80 for TOEFL. The reliability coefficient indicated the degree to which the results on a scale can be considered internally consistent, or reliable (De Vellis, 2003; Ghiasvand, 2008; Moemeni, 2007; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Such finding of reliabilities for the four instruments confirmed the finding of reliabilities in the pilot study. The period of time to administrate each of stages was assigned based on the pilot study.

Data collection procedures in the main study

The data for the study described in this study was collected between September 2010 and November 2010 in Iran, at the Islamic Azad University Branches of three cities that named Abadan, Dezful, and Masjed-Solyman. As stated, these three cities are located in Khuzestan province in south of Iran.



Stage One: At this stage, the participants were asked to answer TOEFL test. Approximately 80 minutes were taken to answer the test (The first week).

Stage Two: At the second stage, the respondents were asked to fill the adapted SILL. The respondents were asked to respond to the questions within 10-15 minutes. Alongside adapted SILL, the Background Questionnaire was administrated (The second week).

Stage Three: At this stage, the NEO-FFI was administrated. 10 - 15 minutes was enough to complete the NEO-FFI (The third week).

Data Analysis: After data collection, the data was entered onto databases (Excel and SPSS) to enable data analysis to be carried out.

The procedure of data analysis includes Pearson Correlation that used to identify the strength and direction of the relationship between variables. As known to the researchers in the field, correlation does not imply causality, but it does provide a picture of relationships. The important point, the classification of strength of correlation is not well accepted among different researchers, and there are different classifications such as the classification suggested by Cohen, (1988), Delavar (2010) and Ghiasvand (2008). In the current study, the classification that was suggested by Cohen, (1988) was chosen as a criterion to interpret and discuss about the strength of the correlation (Table 1).

Table 1. The classification was suggested by Cohen, J (1988)

Level of Strength	Amount of the Strength
Low	$r = .10$ to $.29$
Medium	$r = .30$ to $.49$
Strong	$r = .50$ to 1

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations (SD) of the five traits of personality in the current study

Personality Trait	N	Mean	SD
Neuroticism	213	23.0	8.3
Extraversion	213	27.4	5.5
Openness to Experiences	213	27.9	4.7
Agreeableness	213	32.4	5.4
Conscientiousness	213	34.7	6.3

Results, discussion and conclusion

In reporting the frequency use of LLSs, Oxford's key (1990) was used to understand mean scores on the SILL in the current study.

In the entire sample (N=213), except the Meta-cognitive category, the mean score for each of the five categories fell in the range of medium strategy use. The strategies in the Meta-cognitive category were the most

frequently used, with a mean of 3.7(SD=0.64). The mean use of strategies in the other five categories were 3.2(SD=0.63) for Compensation Strategies, 3.1(SD=0.69) for Affective Strategies, 3.1(SD=0.79) for Social Strategies, 3.0(SD=0.59) for Memory Strategies, and 3.0(SD=0.52) for Cognitive Strategies. Mean of the overall strategy use was 3.2(SD=0.45), which categorized as a medium level. Except the Meta-cognitive category, there was not much difference in the mean scores of strategy use among the other five categories.

The means were calculated in order to determine the mean of each of five traits of personality among the total group of the respondents (N=213) (Table 2).

Table 2 showed that the mean of the Conscientiousness trait (Mean=34.7, SD=6.3) was more than each of the means of the other four traits, and the mean of the Neuroticism trait (Mean=23.0, SD=8.3) was less than each of the means of the other four traits.

The Pearson Correlation was performed for all the overall six categories of strategy use and the Extraversion trait (Table 3).

According to Table 3, regarding the Extraversion trait, the students' strategy use was significant positively correlated with the Extraversion trait for one category (the overall Memory strategy use) at the $p < 0.01$ level (2-tailed), for each of the two of categories of the overall strategy use (the overall Meta-cognitive, or Social strategy use at the $p < 0.05$ level (2-tailed)). The level of correlation for all the categories was found at low level. For each of the other three categories (the overall Cognitive, Compensation, or Affective strategy use), the correlation was non-significant.

Table 3 indicated that based on increasing of the Extraversion trait level of the students, higher average of Memory Strategies would be used, and based on decreasing of the Extraversion trait level, lower average of Memory Strategies would be used. In such way, Table 3 showed that there was a meaningful significant positive relationship between the overall Memory strategy use and the Extraversion trait ($r=0.261$, $p < 0.01$). The positive relationship implies that the more extraverted students use Memory Strategies more.

According to Table 3, the students' overall Cognitive strategy use was not significant correlated with the Extraversion trait ($p > 0.05$). In such way, Table 3 indicated that there was not a meaningful significant relationship between the overall Cognitive strategy use and the Extraversion trait.

Table 3. The summary of correlations among the overall six categories of strategy use and Extraversion trait

		MEM. S.	COG. S.	COM. S.	MET. S.	AFF. S.	SOC. S.
Extraversion	Pearson Correlation	.261	.089	.042	.166	.022	.168
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.195	.538	.015	.747	.014
	N	213	213	213	213	213	213

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)



According to Table 3, the students' overall Compensation strategy use was not significantly correlated with the Extraversion trait ($p > 0.05$). In such way, Table 3 indicated that there was not a meaningful significant relationship between the overall Compensation strategy use and the Extraversion trait.

Based on increasing of the Extraversion trait level of the students, higher average of Meta-cognitive Strategies would be used, and based on decreasing of the Extraversion trait level, lower average of Meta-cognitive Strategies would be used. In such way, Table 3 showed that there was a meaningful significant positive relationship between the overall Meta-cognitive strategy use and the Extraversion trait ($r = 0.166$, $p < 0.05$). The positive relationship implies that the more extraverted students use Meta-cognitive Strategies more.

The students' overall Affective strategy use was not correlated with the Extraversion trait ($p > 0.05$). In such way, Table 3 indicated that there was not a meaningful significant relationship between the overall Affective strategy use and the Extraversion trait.

Based on increasing of the Extraversion trait level of the students, higher average of Social Strategies would be used, and based on decreasing of the Extraversion trait level, lower average of Social Strategies would be used. In such way, Table 3 showed that there was a meaningful significant positive relationship between the overall Social strategy use and the Extraversion trait ($r = 0.168$, $p < 0.05$). The positive relationship implies that the more extraverted students use Social Strategies more.

Limitations of the current study

Like any study, several of limitations to the methodology in this study are ones common in the literature. Firstly, the need for a large scale since the present study includes small-scale study.

Secondly, it is exclusive reliance on self-report responses to the questionnaires. Since the questionnaire is a self-report and single source of information in this study, it is not clear whether the participants actively used the strategies they indicated and personality that they have. Their response may not be just their beliefs and thoughts that they have about their use of strategies and their personality. In order to investigate students' actual use of strategies, researcher must observe classes, use think-aloud procedure (introspection), interview, and so forth. Moreover, there may also have been some unclear points in questionnaires themselves. In addition, the vagueness of wording has been another persistent problem in using questionnaire (Gu *et al.*, 1995). Another difficulty in cross-language research involves translation. In the case of SILL, SILL does not describe in detail the LLSs a student uses in responses to any specific language task.

The third one, there is an issue in the statistical procedures. The reliability estimates internal consistency may not be appropriate to measure something that could

fluctuate in short period. The test-retest reliability measure is better indicator of reliability in this type of research.

The fourth issue, since measurements which are developed in the western countries may not be so successfully employed in the eastern countries like Iran, and many value measurements which are developed in western countries were not success to assess in eastern countries (Matthews, 2000; Schwartz *et al.*, 2001). In the case of used instruments, may some limitations disappeared. Such limitations are characteristics of cross cultural-research and instruments.

Generally speaking, it is rarely possible to adequately control for all variables in any natural research, in this way it is better that it should be some research method to corroborate the results of the SILL and the NEO-FFI.

References

1. Brown HD (1973) Affecting variables in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*. 23 (2), 231-244.
2. Brown JD (1996) Testing in language programs. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
3. Busch D (1982) Introversion-extraversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*. 32,109-132.
4. Chamot AU (2005) Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Ann .Rev.Appl. Linguistics*. 25, 112-130.
5. Chamot AU, Barnhardt S, El-Dinnary PB and Rubbins J (1999) The learning strategies handbook. New York: Longman.
6. Cohen AD and Scott K (1996) A synthesis of approaches to assessing language learning strategies. In R. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: cross cultural perspectives* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. pp: 89-106.
7. Cohen J (1988) Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd edi). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
8. Cook V (2008) Second language learning and language teaching (4th ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
9. Costa PT and McCare RR (1988) Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO personality inventory. *J. Personality & Social Psychol.* 54(4), 853-863.
10. Costa PT and McCare RR (1992) Professional Manual for the NEO-PI-R and NEO-FFI. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
11. Delavar A (2010) Theoretical and experimental principle of research in human sciences. Tehran: Roshd Publ.
12. DeVellis RF (2003) Scale development: Theory and application (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

13. Dewaele J and Furnham A (1999). Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning*. 49, 509-514.
14. Digman JM (1989) Five robust traits dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *J. Personality*. 57(1), 195-214.
15. Digman JM and Inouye J (1986) Further specification of the five robust factors of personality. *J. Personality & Social Psychol.* 50, 116-123.
16. Ehrman ME, Leaver BL and Oxford RL (2003) A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System*. 31, 313-330.
17. Ehrman M and Oxford RL (1990) Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language J.* 74(3), 311-327.
18. Ellis R (1985) Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
19. Ellis R (1994) The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Ely CM (1986) An analysis of discomfort, risk taking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning*. 36(1), 1-25.
21. Fathi-Ashtiani A (2009) Psychological tests: Personality and mental health. Tehran: Be'sat Publ. Institute.
22. Foster JJ (1998) Data analysis using SPSS for window: A beginner's guide. Thousand, Oaks, California: Sage Publ.
23. Gass S and Selinker L (1994) Second language acquisition: An introductory course. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
24. Ghiasvand A (2008) Application of statistics and SPSS in data analysis. Tehran: Lovieh publ.
25. Goldberg LR (1981) Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Rev. Personality & social psychology*. 2, 141-165. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
26. Goldberg LR (1990) An alternative description of personality: The big five factor structure. *J. Personality & Social Psychol.* 59, 1216-1229.
27. Golkar M and Yamini M (2007) Vocabulary, proficiency and reading comprehension. *The Reading Matrix*, 7(3), 88-112.
28. Gould SJ (1981) The mismeasure of man. New York: Norton.
29. Grainger PR (1997) Language-learning strategies for learners of Japanese: investigating ethnicity. *Foreign Language Ann.* 30(3), 378-385.
30. Green JM and Oxford RL (1995) A closer look at learning strategies, L2 proficiency, and gender. *TESOL Quarterly*. 29(2), 261-297.
31. Griffiths C (2002) Using reading as a strategy for teaching and learning language. Paper presented at the International Conference on First and Second Literacy Strategies (College Park, MD, November 1-2, 2002). Retrieved March 20, 2010, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage01/0000019b/80/1b/50/aa.pdf
32. Griffiths C (2004) Language learning strategies: Theory and research. Occasional Paper (1). Retrieved March 12, 2010, from http://www.crie.org.nz/research_paper/c_griffiths_op1.pdf.
33. Gu PY, Wen Q and Wu D (1995) How often is *Oftener?* Reference ambiguities of the likert-scale in language learning strategy research. *Occasional Papers in English Language Teaching*, 5, 19-35. ELT Unit, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
34. Hinkin TR (1998) A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Res. Methods*. 1(1), 104-121.
35. Hsiao T-Y and Oxford RL (2002) Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Modern Language J.* 86(3), 368-383.
36. John OP (1990) The big five factor taxonomy: dimensions of personality in the nature language and in the questionnaire. In L.A. Pervin(Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. pp.66-100. New York: Guilford Press.
37. John OP and Srivastava S (1999) The big five taxonomy: History, measurement and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford. Retrieved March 16, 2010, from <http://pages.uoregon.edu/sanjay/pubs/bigfive.pdf>.
38. Kiany GR (1998). English proficiency and academic achievement in relation to Extraversion: a preliminary study. *Internat. J. Appli. Linguistics*. 8(1), 113-129.
39. MacIntyre PD and Charos C(1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *J. Language & Social Psychol.* 15(1), 3-26.
40. Maleske RT (1995) Foundations for gathering and interpreting behavior data. Pacific Grove, C. A: Brooks/Cole Publ. Company.
41. Marti'nez IMP (1996) The importance of language learning strategies in foreign language teaching. *Cuadernos de Filologia Inglesa*, 5(1), 103-120. Retrieved March 16, 2010, from http://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/fichero_articulo?codigo=1325566&orden=0.
42. Matthews BM (2000) The Chinese value survey: An interpretation of value scales and consideration of some preliminary results. *Int. Edu. J.* 11(2), 117-126.
43. McCare RR and Costa PT Jr (1985) Updating Norman's adequate taxonomy: Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *J. Personality & Psychol.* 49, 710-721.
44. McCare RR and John OP (1992) An introduction to the Five-Factor Model and its application. *J. Personality*. 60(2), 175-215.
45. Moemeni M (2007) *Statistical analysis with SPSS*. Tehran: Ketab neo Publ.



46. Nunnally JC and Bernstein IH (1994) Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
47. Nyikos M and Oxford RL (1993) A factor analytic study of language learning strategy use: Interpretations from information-processing theory and social psychology. *Modern Language J.* 77, 11-22.
48. O'Malley JM and Chamot AU (1990) Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
49. O'Malley JM, Chamot AU, Stewner-Manzanares G, Kupper L and Russo RP (1985) Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning.* 35(1), 21-46.
50. Oxford RL (1990) Language learning strategies: *What every teacher should know.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
51. Oxford RL (1994) Language learning strategies: An update. *Online Resources: Digest.* Retrieved March 08, 2010, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/oxford01.html>.
52. Oxford RL (1996) Employing a questionnaire to assess the use of language learning strategies. *Appl. Language Learning.* 7(1 & 2), 25-45.
53. Oxford RL and Burry-Stock J (1995) Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System.* 23(1), 1-23.
54. Oxford RL and Ehrman M (1995) Adult's language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System.* 23(3), 359-386.
55. Oxford R L and Nyikos M (1989) Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language J.* 73(3), 291-300.
56. Park G (1997) Language learning strategies and English proficiency in Korean university students. *Foreign Language Ann.* 30,211-221.
57. Paunonen SV and O'Connor MC (2007) Big Five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance. *Personality & Individual Differences.* 43, 971-990.
58. Riazi AM (1999) A dictionary of research methods: *Quantitative and qualitative.* Tehran: Rahnama Publications.
59. Reiss MA (1983) Helping the unsuccessful language learner. *Can. Modern Language Rev.* 39(2), 257-266.
60. Robinson D, Gabriel N and Katchan O (1994) Personality and second language learning. *Personality & Individual Differences.* 16(1), 143-157.
61. Saucier G and Goldberg LR (1996) Evidence for the Big Five in analyses of familiar English personality adjectives. *European J. Personality.* 7, 1-17.
62. Schwartz SH, Malech G, Lehmann A, Burgess S, Harris M and Owens V (2001) Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *J. Cross-Cultural Psychol.* 32(5), 519-542.
63. Sharp A (2008) Personality and second language learning. *Asian Social Science,* 4(11), 17-25.
64. Shokri O, Kadivar P, Valizadeh F and Sangari AK (2007) Role of personality traits and learning approaches on a academic achievements of university students. *Psychol. Res.* 9(3&4), 65-84.
65. Smart JC (1970) Underachievers and overachievers in intermediate French. *Modern Language J.* 54(6), 415-420.
66. Strong M (1983) Social styles and the second language acquisition of Spanish speaking kindergartners. *TEOSL-Quarterly,* 17(2), 241-258.
67. Szu-Hsin Y, Ting-Hui Y and Tzu-Ying W (2006) Language learning strategy use of applied foreign language students in Si-Hu senior high school. Retrieved March 15, 2010, from <http://www.shs.edu.tw/works/essay/2007/03/2007032815370457.pdf>
68. Yang MN (2007) Language learning strategies for junior college students in Taiwan: investigating ethnicity and proficiency. *Asian EFL J.* 9(2), 35-57. Retrieved March 11, 2011, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_07_mny.php.