Indian Journal of Science and Technology Vol. 5 No. 8 (August 2012) ISSN: 0974- 6846

The prediction use of English language learning strategies based on personality traits among the female university level learners

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

Abstract

The current study aims to explore the prediction use of English language learning strategies based on personality traits among female university level learners of English language as a university major subject at Islamic Azad University in Iran. Four instruments were used, which were the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) of Rebecca L. Oxfords, A Background Questionnaire, the NEO-Five Factors Inventory (NEO-FFI), and the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Two hundred and thirteen Iranian female students volunteered to participate in this research study. The intact classes were chosen. The obtained results in this study show that the Conscientiousness trait and the Extraversion trait best predicted the overall use of Memory strategies of the students, and the Openness to Experiences trait and the Conscientiousness trait best predicted the overall use of Cognitive strategies, Compensation strategies, Metacognitive strategies, Affective strategies, and Social strategies of the learners.

Keywords: English Language, Learning strategies, Personality trait, Female students, Islamic Azad University, Iran

Introduction

In the last three decades, an important shift has taken place in the field of a second/foreign language learning, and researchers have focused mainly on learner's individual factors, that it might be appropriate to comply with Wenden (1985) who reminds us, there is a proverb stating "Give a man a fish and he eats for a day. Teach him how to fish and he eats for a lifetime". Applying such proverb in language teaching and learning, tells us that if learners are taught strategies of language learning to work out, they will be empowered to manage their own learning. In such a way, Ellis (1985) claims that native language speakers use the same strategy types as learners of second/foreign language use. In addition, Chamot *et al.* (1999) point out that "Differences between more effective learners and less effective learners were found in the number and range of strategies used" (p.166). Therefore, the importance of encouraging using language learning strategies (LLSs) is undeniable. Moreover, even the researchers (O'Malley*et al.,*1985; Oxford, 1990) support the belief that learners who receive learner training, generally learn better than there who do not.

The premise underlying line of this research is that success through English Language Learning Strategies (ELLSs) plays an important role in affecting learners' English language learning process. In addition, in the light of previous findings, a myriad of factors have been identified related to ELLSs (Seyed Hossein Fazeli, 2012a,b,c). One of the most fundamental factors that will be addressed in the current study is personality of the learners. Many researchers agree that personality variable should be taken into account when predicating the choice and use of ELLSs.

There are enough evidences that show personality factors can facilitate acquisition of second language (Reiss, 1983; Strong, 1983; Ely, 1986). Such situation causes to conclude various research works on the relationship between LLSs as one component of linguistics part and personality as psychological part.

In the way of addition to the earlier research, the current study hopes to contribute comprehension of the prediction of ELLSs based personality traits. Such understanding is approached from different directions in order to explore the basic psychological traits and individual differences of elements which influence the choice and use of ELLSs.

Methodology

Participants

The selected participants of this study were 213 Iranian female students studying in third grade (year) of English major of B.A. Degree at Islamic Azad University in Iran, ranging age from 19 to 28 (Mean= 23.4, SD= 2).

Instrumentation in the current study

Strategy inventory for language learning (SILL): It is a kind of self-report questionnaire that has been used extensively by 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). It includes Memory strategies (9 items), Cognitive strategies (14 items), Compensation strategies (6 items), Metacognitive strategies (9 items), Affective strategies (6 items), and Social strategies (6 items).

NEO-Five factors inventory (NEO-FFI): Factor structure resembling the five factors of personality was identified in numerous sets of variables (Goldberg, 1981, 1990; McCare& Costa, 1985; Digman & Inouye, 1986; John, 1990; Saucier & Goldberg, 1990). The NEO-Five Factors Inventory, based on such five factors, measures aspects of individual personality by asking questions about behaviors, attitudes, and reactions (Costa & McCare, 1992). It includes groups of questions related to five personality dimensions. The dimensions composing the NEO-Five Factors include Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experiences, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (12 items for each sub-scale).

©Indian Society for Education and Environment (iSee)

Indian Journal of Science and Technology Vol. 5 No. 8 (August 2012) ISSN: 0974- 6846

Table 1. The model summary of the equation

Model	Variables Entered	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	Conscientiousness	.304[a]	.092	.088	.55918
2	Extraversion	.351[b]	.123	.115	.55083

Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). Dependent Variable: Memory strategies; a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness; b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness, Extraversion

Table 2. The results of regressionalANOVA[c] of the equation

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square		F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.714	1	6.714	21.474	.000[a]
	Residual	65.975	211	.313		
	Total	72.690	212			
2	Regression	8.973	2	4.486	14.786	.000[b]
	Residual	63.717	210	.303		
	Total	72.690	212			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness; b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness, Extraversion; c. Dependent Variable: Memory strategies

Table 3. The Unstandardized coefficients[a], t tests and significances for different models predicted of the equation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.036	.216		9.432	.000
	Conscientiousness	.340	.073	.304	4.634	.000
2	(Constant)	1.686	.248		6.792	.000
	Conscientiousness	.276	.076	.247	3.632	.000
	Extraversion	.234	.086	.185	2.728	.007

a. Dependent Variable: Memory strategies

Moreover, many studies used five factors of personality questionnaire shows both good internal and external validity for such inventory (Costa & McCare, 1992).

Test of English as a foreign language (TOEFL): Since generally there is a significant impact of English language proficiency on the overall academic achievement of the students (Fakeye & Ogunsiji, 2009), and specifically there is a relationship between strategy use and language proficiency (Abu Shmais, 2004), therefore because of nature of this research work (regarding the use of ELLSs), a general English proficiency test was used.

Based on the type of proficiency of English language, time limitation and difficulty for administration of full parts of TOEFL, and the other limitations cause to choose Structure and Written Expression, and Reading Comprehension of one sample of TOEFL as an English proficiency test in the current study.

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

The procedure of adaptation of instruments

All the three questioners were translated to Persian in previous studies. Again, the researcher, in the case of SILL, translated it to Persian language.

Pilot study

Thirty nine female students learning English language as a university major were asked to participate in the pilot study.

Data collection procedures in the main study

Data for this study was collected between September 2010 and November 2010, at three stages. At first stage, the participants were asked to answer TOEFL. At the second stage, the respondents were asked to fill the Persian adapted version of SILL. Along the adapted Persian version of SILL, the Background Questionnaire was administrated. At the third stage, NEO-FFI was administrated.

Data analysis procedures in the main study

The data obtained through the instruments was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Multiple regression was used for analyzing the data. In multiple regression, the stepwise method was adapted; moreover it is the most applied method to make a model (Ghiasvand, 2008). In addition, the interpretation of the stepwise method of multiple regression analysis was done based on the samples used earlier (Pallant, 2007; Ghisvand, 2008; Kalantari, 2008). The Adjusted R-Square statistics was used in order to give the proportion of variance, and the total changes in the dependent variables. Because it is more reliable than R-Square statistics (Moemeni, 2007, Ghisvand, 2008; Kalantari, 2008).

Results and discussion

Reliability of the instruments

The reliability of our experimental measures was assessed by calculating Cronbach's alpha over the items of the three instruments across all the participants in the current study which were found to be: .92 for SILL, .82 for NEO-FFI, and .80 for TOEFL. Such findings of reliabilities

©Indian Society for Education and Environment (iSee)

Indian Journal of Science and Technology Vol. 5 No. 8 (August 2012) ISSN: 0974- 6846

Table 4.The model summary of the equation

Model	Variables Entered	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	Openness to Experiences	.202[a]	.041	.036	.51381
2	Conscientiousness	.266[b]	.071	.062	.50690

Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). Dependent Variable: Cognitive strategies. a. Predictors: (Constant), Openness to Experiences; b. Predictors: (Constant), Openness to Experiences, Conscientiousness

Table 5. The results of regressionalANOVA[c] of the equation

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.371	1	2.371	8.980	.003[a]
	Residual	55.703	211	.264		
	Total	58.074	212			
2	Regression	4.114	2	2.057	8.006	.000[b]
	Residual	53.960	210	.257		
	Total	58.074	212			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Openness to Experiences
b. Predictors: (Constant), Openness to Experiences, Conscientiousness
c. Dependent Variable: Cognitive strategies

for the three instruments confirm the finding of reliabilities in the pilot study.

Frequency use of LLSs

In the entire sample, the strategies in the Metacognitive category were the most frequently used, with a mean of 3.7(SD=.64). The mean use of strategies in the other five categories were 3.2(SD=.63) for Compensation strategies, 3.1(SD=.69) for Affective strategies, 3.1(SD=.79) for Social strategies, 3.0(SD=.59) for Memory strategies, and 3.0(SD=.52) for Cognitive strategies. Mean of the overall strategy use was 3.2(SD=.45), which categorized as a medium level. Except the Metacognitive category, there was not much difference in the mean scores of strategy use among the other five categories.

Determining means of the five traits of personality

In the entire sample, the means were calculated in order to determine mean of the each of five traits of personality among the total group of the respondents (N=213). The mean of trait was 23.0 (SD=8.3) for the Neuroticism trait, 27.4 (SD=5.5) for the Extraversion trait, 27.9 (SD=4.7) for the Openness to Experiences trait, 32.4 (SD=5.4) for the Agreeableness trait, and 34.7 (SD=6.3) for the Conscientiousness trait.

The prediction use of ELLSs based on personality traits: For the summary of the results, the output of multiple regression which was performed to examine the prediction use of ELLSs based on the five traits of personality is presented. The results of such statistical methods showed the following results which were categorized as different sub-sections.

The prediction use of memory strategies based personality traits

According to Table 1, based on the adjustedR-Square, the emerged model for the two independent variables with the Adjusted R-Square of .115, accounted for explaining about 11.5% of the variance of the students' overall Memory strategy use.

Further, Table 2 (regressional ANOVA) showed that the effect was significant, and all the models had high F values (F=21.474, F=14.786, P< .01).

According to Table 3, the effect of the Conscientiousness trait was greater than the effect of the Extraversion trait to change the overall Memory strategy use; because of the obtained Beta for the Conscientiousness trait showed that for each of one unit of value of change in the Standard Deviation of the Conscientiousness trait, the amount of change .247 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Memory strategy use. However, for the Extraversion trait, for each of one unit of value of change in its Standard Deviation, the amount of change .185 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Memory strategy use. From the above table, it is further evident that for all the predicted models and constants, the t values ranged from 2.728 to 9.432, which were all found to be significant, and significance levels ranged from .007 to .000 level. Thus the Conscientiousness trait, and the Extraversion trait best predicted the overall use of Memory strategies of the students.

The prediction use of cognitive strategies based personality traits: According to Table 4, based on the Adjusted R-Square, the emerged model for two independent variables with the Adjusted R-Square of .062, accounted for explaining about 6.2% of the variance of the students' overall Cognitive strategy use.

Further, Table 5 (regression ANOVA) showed that

Table 6. The Unstandardized coefficients[a], t tests and significances for different models predicted of the equation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.419	.211		11.459	.000
	Openness to Experiences	.268	.089	.202	2.997	.003
2	(Constant)	1.987	.266		7.459	.000
	Openness to Experiences	.236	.089	.178	2.652	.009
	Conscientiousness	.175	.067	.175	2.605	.010

Dependent Variable: Cognitive strategies

Indian Journal of Science and Technology Vol. 5 No. 8 (August 2012) ISSN: 0974- 6846

the effect was significant, and all the models had high F values (F=8.980, F=8.006, P< .01).

According to Table 6, the effect of the Openness to Experiences trait was greater than the effect of the Conscientiousness trait to change the overall Cognitive strategy use, because of the obtained Beta for the Openness to Experiences trait showed that for each of one unit of value of change in the Standard Deviation of the Openness to Experiences trait, the amount change .178 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Cognitive strategy use. However, for the Conscientiousness trait, for each of one unit of value of change in its Standard Deviation, the amount change .175 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Cognitive strategy use. From the above table, it was further evident that for all the predicted models and constants, the t values ranged from 2.605 to 11.459, which were all found to be significant, and significance levels ranged from .010 to .000 level. Thus, the traits like the Openness to Experiences trait, and the Conscientiousness traitbest predicted the overall use of Cognitive Strategies of the students.

The prediction use of compensation strategies based personality traits: According to Table 7, based on the Adjusted R-Square, the emerged model for the two independent variables with the Adjusted R-Square of .055, accounted for explaining about 5.5% of the variance of the students' overall Compensation strategy use.

Further, Table 8 (regressional ANOVA) showed that the effect was significant, and all the models had high F values (F=7.944, F=7.150, P<.01).

According to Table 9, although the amount of B for the Openness to Experiences was greater than the amount of B for the Conscientiousness trait, the Conscientiousness trait has greater effect on the amount change of the overall compensation strategy use. Because of the obtained Beta for the Conscientiousness trait showed that for each of one unit of value of change in the Standard Deviation of the Conscientiousness trait, the amount change .168 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall compensation strategy use. However, the obtained Beta for the Openness to Experiences trait showed that for each of one unit of value of change in its Standard Deviation, the amount change .167 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Compensation strategy use. It was further evident that for all the predicted models and constants, the t values ranged from 2.482 to 10.469, which were all found to be significant, and significance levels ranged from .014 to .000 level. To conclude, the Conscientiousness trait, and the Openness

Table 7. The model summary of the equation

Model	Variables Entered	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	Conscientiousness	.190[a]	.036	.032	.62557
2	Openness to Experiences	.252[b]	.064	.055	.61805

Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). Dependent Variable: Compensation strategies; a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness; b. Predictors: (Constant); Conscientiousness, Openness to Experiences

Table 8. The results of regressional ANOVA[c] of the equation

	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.109	1	3.109	7.944	.005[a]	.005[a]
	Residual	82.571	211	.391			
	Total	85.680	212				
2	Regression	5.462	2	2.731	7.150	.001[b]	.001[b]
	Residual	80.218	210	.382			
	Total	85.680	212				

a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness; b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness, Openness to Experiences; c. Dependent Variable: Compensation strategies

Table 9. The Unstandardized coefficients[a], t tests and significances for different models predicted of the equation

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.528	.241		10.469	.000
	Conscientiousness	.232	.082	.190	2.819	.005
2	(Constant)	1.981	.325		6.101	.000
	Conscientiousness	.204	.082	.168	2.486	.014
	Openness to Experiences	.270	.109	.167	2.482	.014

Dependent Variable: Compensation strategies

Table 10. The model summary of the equation

Model	Variables Entered	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	Conscientiousness	.372[a]	.138	.134	.59207
2	Openness to Experiences	.430[b]	.185	.177	.57720

Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). Dependent Variable: Metacognitive strategies, a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness; b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness, Openness to Experiences

Indian Journal of Science and Technology Vol. 5 No. 8 (August 2012) ISSN: 0974- 6846

Table 11. The results of regressional ANOVA[c] of the equation

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.852	1	11.852	33.810	.000[a]
	Residual	73.966	211	.351		
	Total	85.819	212			
2	Regression	15.854	2	7.927	23.793	.000[b]
	Residual	69.964	210	.333		
	Total	85.819	212			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness; b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness, Openness to Experiences; c. Department Variable : Metacognitive strategies

Table 12. The Unstandardized Coefficients[a], t tests and Significances for different models predicted of the equation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.369	.229		10.364	.000
	Conscientiousness	.452	.078	.372	5.815	.000
2	(Constant)	1.656	.303		5.459	.000
	Conscientiousness	.416	.077	.342	5.434	.000
	Openness to Experiences	.352	.101	.218	3.466	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Metacognitive strategies

to Experiences trait best predicted the overall use of Compensation strategies of the students.

The prediction use of metacognitive strategies based personality traits: According to Table 10, based on the Adjusted R-Square, the emerged model for the two independent variables with the Adjusted R-Square of .177, accounted for explaining about 17.7% of the variance of the students' overall Metacognitive strategy use. Table 11 (regressional ANOVA) showed that the effect was significant, and all the models had high F values (F=33.810, F=23.793, P< .01).

According to Table 12, the effect of the Conscientiousness trait was greater than the effect of the Openness to Experiences trait to change the overall Metacognitive strategy use. The obtained Beta for the Conscientiousness trait showed that for each of one unit of value of change in the Standard Deviation of the Conscientiousness trait, the amount of change .342 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Metacognitive strategy use. However, for the Openness to Experiences trait, for each of one unit of value of change in its Standard Deviation, the amount of change .218 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Metacognitive strategy use. It was further evident that for all the predicted models and constants, the t values ranged from 3.466 to 10.364, which were all found to be significant, and significance levels ranged from .001 to .000 level. Thus, the traits like the Conscientiousness trait, and the Openness to Experiences trait best predicted the overall use of Metacognitive Strategies of the students.

The prediction use of affective strategies based personality traits: According to Table 13, based on the Adjusted R-Square, the emerged model for the two independent variables with the Adjusted R-Square of .082, accounted for explaining about 8.2% of the variance of the students' overall Affective strategy use. Further, Table 14 (regressional ANOVA) showed that the effect was significant, and all the models had high F values (F=12.768, F=10.440, P< .01).

According to Table 15, the effect of the Openness to Experiences trait was greater than the effect of the Conscientiousness trait to change the overall Affective strategy use, because of the obtained Beta for the Openness to Experiences trait showed that for each of one unit of value of change in the Standard Deviation of the Openness to Experiences trait, the amount of change .214 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Affective strategy use. However, for the Conscientiousness trait, for each of one unit of value of change in its Standard Deviation, the amount change .184 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Affective strategy use. From the above table, it was further evident that for all the predicted models and constants, the t values ranged from 2.776 to 7.789, which all were found to be significant, and significance levels ranged from .006 to .000 level. In summary, one can conclude that the traits like the Openness to Experiences trait and the Conscientiousness trait best predicted the overall use of Affective strategies of the students.

The prediction use of social strategies based personality traits: According to Table 16, based on the Adjusted R-Square, the emerged model for the two independent variables with the Adjusted R-Square of .089, accounted for explaining about 8.9% of the variance of the students' overall Social strategy use.

Further, Table 17 (regressional ANOVA) showed that the effect was significant, and all the models had high F values (F=14.825, F=11.364, P<.01).

Table 13. The model summary of the equation

Model	Variables Entered	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	Openness to Experiences	.239[a]	.057	.053	.66967
2	Conscientiousness	.301[b]	.090	.082	.65928

Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100, Dependent Variable: Affective strategies; a. Predictors: (Constant), Openness to Experiences; b. Predictors: (Constant), Openness to Experiences, Conscientiousness

Indian Journal of Science and Technology Vol. 5 No. 8 (August 2012) ISSN: 0974- 6846

Table 14. The results of regressional ANOVA[c] of the equation

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.726	1	5.726	12.768	.000[a]
	Residual	94.625	211	.448		
	Total	100.351	212			
2	Regression	9.075	2	4.538	10.440	.000[b]
	Residual	91.276	210	.435		
	Total	100.351	212			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Openness to Experiences; b. Predictors: (Constant), Openness to Experiences, Conscientiousness; c. Dependent Variable: Affective strategies.

Table 15.The Unstandardized Coefficients[a], t tests and significances for different models predicted of the equation

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.143	.275		7.789	.000
Openness to Experiences	.417	.117	.239	3.573	.000
(Constant)	1.544	.346		4.457	.000
Openness to Experiences	.373	.116	.214	3.215	.002
Conscientiousness	.243	.087	.184	2.776	.006

a) Dependent Variable: Affective strategies

According to Table 18, although the amount of B for the Openness to Experiences was greater than the amount of B for the Conscientiousness trait, the Conscientiousness trait has greater effect on change of the overall social strategy use. Because of the obtained Beta for the Openness to Experiences trait showed that for each of one unit of value of change in the Standard Deviation of the Openness to Experiences trait, the amount of change .181 occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Social strategy use. However, the obtained Beta for the Conscientiousness trait showed each of one unit of value of change in its Standard Deviation, the amount of change .231occurred in the Standard Deviation of the overall Social strategy use. It was further evident that for all the predicted models and constants, the t values ranged from 2.730 to 6.599, which all were found to be significant, and significance levels ranged from .007 to .000 level. In summary, one can conclude that the traits like the Conscientiousness trait, and the Openness to Experiences trait best predicted the overall use of Social strategies of the students.

Table 16. The model summary of the equation

Model	Variables Entered	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	Conscientiousness	.256[a]	.066	.061	.76566
2	Openness to Experiences	.313[b]	.098	.089	.75422

Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). Dependent Variable: Social strategies. a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness; b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness, Openness to Experiences

Conclusion

Regarding prediction use of ELLSs based on the five traits of personality, it was found that the Conscientiousness trait and the Extraversion trait best predicted the overall use of Memory strategies of the students. The Openness to Experiences trait and the Conscientiousness traitbest predicted the overall use of Cognitive strategies, Compensation strategies, Metacognitive strategies, Affective strategies, and Social strategies of the students. Moreover, the amount of variance in each table as the variance of prediction depends on the goal of a researcher who decides how much of the variance can be as an enough criterion to predict the use of ELLSs.

Generally, there is not much specific study regarding such type of relationship between ELLSs and personality traits in related literature. In such way, there was not good criterion to contrast and compare the results of this study with other results. However, there is one study by Sharp (2008). Sharp (2008) found that there is no relationship between LLSs and personality.

Another important point, it must be some counseling sessions with the students regarding personality traits and how to choose and use ELLSs. Such counseling sessions can facilitate the students' understanding of their successes, failures, problems and potential related to the discussed relationship between the choice and use ELLSs and personality traits. In such situation, through ELLSs assessment, teachers can help their students to recognize the power of using ELLSs based on their personality for making language learning quicker, easier, and more effective. Moreover, generally speaking, each of ELLSs and personality traits is not "good" or "bad" *per se*, and they in themselves have neither positive nor negative sides.

Limitations of the current study

Regarding the issue of questionnaire, although survey studies have been very illuminating and have yielded important results, the first limitation of this study is that measuring of ELLSs and personality traits were done by using questionnaires.

Regarding the limitations related to sample of participants, the sample was chosen from the Islamic Azad University, Iran. Hence, it may not be representative of English language students in general. The second issue, conducting the study with a larger sample size would permit a greater certainly about the findings and results, but the small size sample was chosen in the present study because of the problems and difficulty in selection of large sample. In this way, generalization of findings may be limited to

Indian Journal of Science and Technology Vol. 5 No. 8 (August 2012) ISSN: 0974- 6846

Table 17. The results of regressional ANOVA[c] of the equation

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.691	1	8.691	14.825	.000[a]
	Residual	123.697	211	.586		
	Total	132.388	212			
2	Regression	12.929	2	6.465	11.364	.000[b]
	Residual	119.459	210	.569		
	Total	132.388	212			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness; b. Predictors: (Constant), Conscientiousness, Openness to Experiences; c. Dependent Variable: Social strategies

population with similar nature, and may not be applicable so well for other groups with speakers of different native languages, educational settings, cultural background, and gender.

Table 18. The Unstandardized Coefficients[a], t tests and significances for different models predicted of the equation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.951	.296		6.599	.000
	Conscientiousness	.387	.101	.256	3.850	.000
2	(Constant)	1.217	.396		3.070	.002
	Conscientiousness	.350	.100	.231	3.498	.001
	Openness to Experiences	.362	.133	.181	2.730	.007

a. Dependent Variable: Social strategies

Regarding the limitations related to statistical method, there is an important issue in the statistical procedures, that it is Cronbach's alpha estimates of internal consistency may not be appropriate to measure something that could fluctuate in short period of time. The test-retest reliability measurement is better indicator of reliability in this type of research.

References

1. Abu Shmais W (2004) The English language learning strategies of Al-Najah national university EFL majors. *J. Islamic Univ. Gaza.* Retrieved July 8, 2010. 12(1), 51-75.
2. Chamot AU, Barnhardt S, El-Dinnary PB and Rubbins J (1999) The learning strategies handbook. NY: Longman.
3. Costa PT and McCare RR (1992) Professional manual for the NEO-PI-R and NEO-FFI. Odessa, FL: *Psychol. Assessment Resources*.
4. Digman JM and Inouye J (1986) Further specification of the five robust factors of personality. *J. Personality & Soc. Psychol.* 50,116-123.
5. Ellis R (1985) Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford Univ. *Press.*
6. Ely CM (1986) An analysis of discomfort, risk taking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Lang. Learning.* 36(1), 1-25.
7. Fakeye DO and Ogunsiji Y (2009) English language proficiency as a predictor of academic achievement among EFL students in Nigeria. *Eur. J. Sci. Res.* 3, 490-495.
8. Ghiasvand A (2008) Application of statistics and SPSS in data analysis. Tehran: Lovieh Publ.
9. Goldberg LR (1981) Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In: Review of Personality and Social Psychology. Wheeler L (Ed.). Beverrly Hills, CA: Sage. 2, 141-165.
10. Goldberg LR (1990) An alternative description of personality: The big five factor structure. *J. Personality & Soc. Psychol.* 59, 1216-1229.
11. John OP (1990) The big five factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the nature language and in the questionnaire. In: Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research. Pervin LA (Ed.). NY: Guilford Press. pp: 66-100.
12. Kalantari K (2008) Data processing and analysis in socio-economic research. Tehran: Farhang Saba Publ.
13. McCare RR and Costa PT Jr (1985) Updating Norman's adequate taxonomy: Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *J. Pers. & Psychol.* 49, 710-721.
14. Moemeni M (2007) Statistical analysis with SPSS. Tehran: Ketab neo Publ.
15. O'Malley JM, Chamot AU, Stewner-Manzanares G, Russo RP and Kupper L (1985) Language strategy application with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly.* 19(13), 557-584.
16. Oxford RL (1990) What every teacher should know. In: Language learning strategies. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
17. Oxford RL (1996) Employing a questionnaire to assess the use of language learning strategies. *Appl. Lang. Learn.* 7(1& 2), 25-45.
18. Pallant J (2007) SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows (3rd ed.). New South Wales, Australia: Allen & Unmin.
19. Reiss MA (1983). Helping the unsuccessful language learner. *Canadian Modern Lang. Rev.*39(2), 257-266.
20. Saucier G and Goldberg LR (1996) Evidence for the big five in analyses of familiar English personality adjectives. *Europ. J. Pers.*7, 1-17.
21. Seyed Hossein Fazeli (2012a) The influence of personality traits on the use of memory English language learning strategies *Indian J.Sci.Technol.* 5 (7) 3041-3046.
22. Seyed Hossein Fazeli (2012b) The overall relationships between the use of English language learning strategies and personality traits among the female university level learners of English language as a University Major. *Indian J. Innovations. Dev.* 1 (7), 523-531.
23. Seyed Hossein Fazeli (2012c) The relationship between the extraversion trait and use of the English language learning strategies. *Indian J.Sci.Technol.* 5 (4) 2651-2657.
24. Sharp A (2008) Personality and second language learning. *Asian Soc. Sci.* 4(11), 17-25.
25. Strong M (1983) Social styles and the second language acquisition of Spanish speaking kindergartners. *TEOSL-Quarterly.*17(2), 241-258.
26. TOEFL samples (2009) Tehran: Rahnama Publ.
27. Wenden A (1985) Learner strategies. *TESOL Newsletter.* 19(5), 1-7.

©Indian Society for Education and Environment (iSee)