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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Learning a second or a foreign language is no more a hobby but it is an essential part of one’s life in the era of globalization. Nowadays, all over the world, people are learning their second and even third and fourth languages. Due to the globalization of business and industry, people who are in a way involved in or affected by this process, are trying to learn English which is the international language. Even in the early stages of life, families are forcing their wards to acquire English which is a fixed and compulsory course of the curriculum in many countries. In some countries, children start acquiring English at the age of five while in some others like Iran the process begins at the age of eleven. There are, however, different views regarding the proper age to start learning a second language.

The curriculum of the educational system of Iran postulates that the formal instruction of English starts at the first year of the junior high school when children finish their 5-year elementary education. The foreign languages that students must compulsorily learn are English and Arabic simultaneously. Of course, Arabic is not that foreign as the students are already familiar with its reading due to its similarity with Persian. Arabic is also the religious language of Iranians and Iranians, like other Muslims, say their daily prayers containing holy chapters of Quran in Arabic. Children in the elementary school also have to pass a course in holy Quran reading and recitation which is in Arabic as well. While learning Arabic, the students concentrate only on the skill of reading and the other skills are given less attention as the main objective is to enable learners to read and recite.

Regarding English as a foreign language in Iran, the situation is completely different due to the following reasons. First, there does not exist any similarity between English and Persian. Second, Persian is an S-O-V type of language while English is an S-V-O language which certainly creates difficulties for learners. And coping with a completely different alphabet is another problem that a Persian language learner faces while learning English.
To start two foreign languages together seems to be a double burden for Iranian students. Moreover, two different teaching methodologies used in the classrooms sometimes overlap as there are two different objectives behind teaching these two languages. Arabic is taught to enable learners to read, recite and somehow translate from Arabic to Persian, while English is taught to enable learners to communicate orally and in the written form. Therefore, four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are taught simultaneously.

Students attend English classes twice per week. Each class lasts for about 80 minutes. This process goes on for three years in junior high school and three years in senior high school, but in senior high school the allotted time is reduced to 2 hours per week. In the pre-university grade, which lasts one year as a college preparatory course, the students attend classes the same hours as their senior high school. This trend goes on through college courses as college students have to pass compulsory general English courses as well as English for specific purposes (ESP) for their related majors. This is only the formal instruction in English. Informal learning of English starts from the age of 3 to 5 as kids are sent to language institutes. Institutes, as opposed to the schools which mostly focus on grammar, give emphasis to speaking and listening, use more teaching aids and audio-visual devices and make the process of language learning more interesting.

This reveals that enough value and importance are being given to learning English as a foreign language but the results obtained from more than 3.4 million students in junior high school and the same number in senior high school in each year are disappointing since less than 10 percent of the population masters basic skills of communication in English after five years of formal education.

The problem relates to three main elements of an educational system: teachers, teaching environment including materials and technology and learners.

1. Teachers: Sometimes teachers are not competent enough either in proficiency or in teaching skills including teaching methodology and classroom management. But in Iran, the problem seems more serious as even in classes run by proficient, well-experienced teachers, few of the students are enabled to use language
in a natural situation. Unfortunately, the teachers do not receive enough in-service training to remain updated.

2. Teaching materials and technologies: The textbooks published for different standards have their own problems. The textbooks are not supported with supplementary materials like teachers’ books, CDs, video books, and work books. The books have been based on a grammar oriented approach. Each unit follows a grammar point, which is a pre-requisite for the next unit. Grammar functions are the core of each unit and other aspects of language receive less attention. Grammar is taught from simple to complicated points whilst the application and authentic use are not considered important. The result is that an Iranian English learner memorizes or even learns the grammar of English from A to Z while he is unable to produce an accurate response to a query.

3. Learners: A student, as the most important element of this process, requires a level of Cognitive and Affective capabilities. He also requires aptitude and attitude in Order to acquire English. In case of affectivity, students in Iran do not find enough incentives to learn English because of many reasons. First, there is not enough exposure to authentic situation in which English would be used communicatively. Widdowson (1978, p.160) believes that by using a communicative approach language can be developed incidentally, as a by-product of using it, and he also believes that “knowing will emerge from doing”, while Littlewood (1981), as quoted in Brown (2000) stresses the need to give learners extensive opportunities to use the target language for real communicative purposes, and believes that the ability to communicate effectively is more important than perfect mastery. Therefore, Iranians do not find it useful to learn English as they do not have a chance to use it out of the classroom. Second, most of the classes are very boring and the materials are presented in unattractive methods. And finally, they think mastering a foreign language is so difficult that they are unable to learn it and that is just because of the complexity of the grammar presented to them as language.

Learning English in India seems quite different. In India English is not a guest. It serves Indians as a dear host. English in India is no more considered even as a second language. It is the official language used in daily communications of most Indians outside their homes and the same number of Indians at home. Indians use an
individualized version of English. Great poets of India have been composing English poems and their writers have been publishing masterpieces of literature in English. Thousands of newspapers, journals, magazines and books are being published in English. More than half of the schools are run in the English medium and TV and radio channels are telecast and broadcast in English. More than 93 per cent of people in some states use English or are able to use it. However, in some states and in some rural areas the estimate of English users may decrease to 20 per cent. Therefore, India, the second most populated country in the world, needs to take some other steps in Order to celebrate 100 percent literacy in English.

In Order to solve all these problems in these three elements of an educational system, it requires more research. Therefore, the researcher tries to study the learner, who is the most important element in the process of learning and without whom learning does not take place, as the subject of his research project. The learner, learning, language learning strategies and the factors which might affect learning abilities of a learner are analyzed and empirically studied in this research.

1.2 What is Learning?

In the domain of language, language teaching and language learning have changed a lot since its beginning in 1940s. Language teaching /learning relies on the findings of two branches of knowledge. On the one hand, it is based on the findings regarding language and on the other hand, it is based on the findings of psychologists on learning. So, any changes in these two fields of study may directly or indirectly affect approaches and methods in handling the affairs of learning and teaching.

1.3 Learning

Before going further into the strategies of learning, have a look at definitions of learning. “Learning is acquiring or getting of knowledge of a subject or a skill by study, experience, or instruction”. “learning is a relatively permanent change in a behavioral tendency and is the result of reinforced practice” (Kimble and Germezy 1963, as quoted in Brown 2000, p. 7). As these definitions have been extracted from general dictionaries, for the purpose of academic works, we need to look for more specialized, academic, and theory-based definitions. The researcher interprets
“learning” notion based on theoretical views of pioneers in learning schools of thought.

1.3.1 Pavlov’s Classical Behaviorism and Skinner’s Operant Conditioning

Ivan Pavlov, the Russian psychologist best known classical behaviorist, defined learning as “the process consisted of the formation of association between stimuli and reflexive responses”. But this definition which is a pure classical behaviorist one is later on revised by Skinner. According to Anderson and Ausubel,(1965, p. 5) ,B. F. Skinner, the founder of Operant Conditioning who was called a neo-behaviorist, believed that “the events or stimuli- reinforces-that follow a response tend to strengthen behavior, they increase the probability of the recurrence of that response ,and they constitute a powerful force in the control of human behavior. Reinforces are far stronger aspects of learning than is mere association of a prior stimuli with a following response, as in the classical conditioning model”. As provided in the given theories, there is not a trace of Cognitive and mental involvement in learning process and learning takes place in an absent-minded situation. But it is a mere 1930s definition of learning because two decades later it is Cognitivists’ turn to define learning based on their own view of learning.

1.3.2 Ausubel’s Meaningful Learning Theory

David Ausubel as quoted in Brown (2000, p. 83) contended that learning takes place in the human organism through meaningful process of relating new events or items to already existing Cognitive concepts or propositions- hanging new items on existing Cognitive pegs. According to Ausubel and Anderson (1965, p. 8) learning is not an implicit response, but a “clearly articulated and precisely differentiated conscious experience that emerges when potentially meaningful signs, symbols, concepts, or propositions are related to and incorporated within a given individual’s Cognitive structure on a non arbitrary and substantive basis”. In this definition, Cognitive structure of a learner and also meaningfulness being of the material to be learned rings the bell for the entrance of a learner in the process of learning as an active involver and not as just an organism who is only respondent to stimuli thrown toward him. It can be considered as the starting point for looking at teaching as a
facilitating learning process. But it was not an end, as a decade later, Rogers, however, not merely a learning psychologist, had a significant impact on the present understanding of learning.

1.3.3 Roger’s Humanistic Psychology

Brown (2000, p. 85) classifies Carl Rogers as “constructivist” than a cognitivist because his humanistic psychology had more of an Affective focus than a Cognitive one.

Rogers’ “phenomenological” perspective regarding human behavior including learning is in sharp contrast to that of Skinner as he considers the “whole person” as a physical and Cognitive, but primarily emotional being (Brown, 2000, p.89). This constructist’s formal principles focused on the development of an individual’s self-concept and his or her personal sense of reality. Whatever distinguishes Roger’s view from that of a cognitivist is the emphasis that he gives to emotions of the learners, their Feelings and learning situations.

According to Brown (2000), Rogers’ position as a human psychologist which falls into the perspective of a constructivist view of learning, is away from “teaching” and toward “learning” and the goal of teaching is the facilitation of change and learning. Brown (2000, p.89) also believes that “learning to learn is more important than being taught something from the superior vantage point of a teacher who unilaterally decides what shall be taught”.

Within the field of education over the last few decades, a gradual but significant shift has taken place, resulting in less emphasis on teachers and teaching and greater emphasis on learners and learning. Reviewing the roles which have been given to a learner in different teaching methods in different eras shows the increasing importance and the greater degree of involvement of the learner in the complex process of learning. It also reveals a shift from teacher –oriented methods into learner –centered ones. This trend can be traced back in the key works on "the learner-centered curriculum" (Nunan, 1988, 1995) and "learner-centeredness as language education" (Tudor, 1996). The active involvement of one’s cognition in the process of acquiring a language in Cognitive Approach and also Communicative Competence of
Hymes in Notional – Functional approach and communicative language teaching (CLT) are other proofs for learner-centeredness of the present teaching methods. The learner roles in different methods will be discussed in the same chapter in details. Now that the learner, his Cognitive ability, and his individual differences are of the main concern in learning process in general and language learning in particular, the researcher tries to keep in mind two subjects which are directly related to these two matters; first, Language Learning Strategies including Memory, Cognitive, Compensation, Metacognitive, Affective, and Social strategies from one hand and second, personality traits which are functioning as a base for individual differences on the other hand. They are reviewed and will be discussed and empirically analyzed for their probable impact on each other. As individual differences of the learners are also another part of learner-oriented methods, personality traits do appear to assign such individual differences. Personality, its measurement and its related matters are discussed in details in this dissertation. This gradual change is somehow due to the appearance of communicative Competence as an approach toward language and constructivists approach toward learning which has been resulted in inclination of language teaching toward language learning and the importance of teacher’s role in the classroom has been given to learner’s role.

1.4 Communicative Competence

Communicative Competence is a concept introduced by Hymes and discussed and redefined by many authors. Hymes’ original idea was that speakers of a language have to have more than grammatical Competence in Order to be able to communicate effectively in a language; they also need to know how language is used by the members of a speech community to accomplish their purposes. Hymes (1972, p. 78) stipulated that ‘there are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless’. The role which is given to a teacher in this approach is as an enabler. In Order to enable someone, you have to give him tools not the material. In language domain, you have to teach students how to learn and enable them to learn. Teaching learning strategies as learning tools seems very important. Communicative Competence is classified into eight aspects. They are divided into two groups of four:
1.4.1 Linguistic Aspects

Linguistic aspects include Phonology and orthography, Grammar, Vocabulary, and Discourse (textual).

1.4.2 Pragmatic Aspects

The pragmatic aspects include Functions, Variations, Interactional skills and Cultural framework.

Even among the pragmatic aspects of this module, interactional skills require the full involvement of the learner in the process of language learning. So, the involvement of a learner in the process of gaining a language and enabling him with tools to work independently forms the building blocks of an approach and, also, a teaching methodology in language teaching especially through teaching learning as well as communication strategies.

1.5 Second Language Learning

Brown (2000) classifies the Second language learning into two broad categories of Cognitive and Affective domains. Cognitive domain consists of two facets: human learning processes in general and Cognitive variations in learning-styles and strategies. Affective domain of second language learning includes two facets as well. The first of these is the intrinsic side of affectivity which is the Personality factors within a person that contribute in some way to the success of language learning. The second facet encompasses extrinsic factors including socio-cultural variables in which the learner is obliged to learn a second culture along with a second language. These two domains are necessary for devising a theory of language acquisition and teaching. Hilgard (1963, p.267) believed that “purely Cognitive theories” as it was common in theories of two decades ago, “will be rejected unless a role is assigned to affectivity”. And Arnold (1999, p. 43) states that “in recent thinking, there is no doubt at all about the importance of examining personality factors in building a theory of second language acquisition”. In this research, the researcher tried to focus on these two domains of Cognitive and Affective factors. From Cognitive factors language learning strategies and from
affectivity aspects personality factors were selected. The researcher tried to empirically study the effect of personality factors on the type and frequency of language learning strategies which is applied in acquiring the second language. It has been hypothesized that the selection and frequency of implementing learning and communication strategies, as a Cognitive factor involved in language learning, are affected by the intrinsic side of affectivity – personality factors. But what are strategies and how they are defined?

1.6 An Introduction to Language Learning Strategies

Wenden (1985) reminds us of the old proverb which states that give a man a fish and he eats for a day. Teach him how to fish and he eats for a lifetime. Griffiths (2004) applies this in the language teaching and learning field and concludes that if teachers provide their students with an immediate answer, they would solve a problem. But if they teach them the strategies to work out their own answers, they empower them to manage their own learning. He also uses another English proverb that one can lead a horse to water but he cannot make him drink to come to this conclusion that it is the learner who must make the final decision and students are the ones who can do the learning. So even the best teachers, teaching methods and technologies cannot create any learning change, if the learners do not actively get involved in the learning Activity. Therefore, teachers must help their learners to learn how to learn better through teaching learning strategies which is a technique in empowering learners with a tool to learn better.

1.6.1 The Importance of LLS in SL/FL Learning and Teaching

Learning strategies are important in second language learning and teaching for two major reasons. First, by examining the strategies used by second language learners during the language learning process, we gain insights into the Metacognitive, Cognitive, Social, and Affective processes involved in language learning. The second reason supporting research into language learning strategies is that less successful language learners can be taught new strategies, thus helping them become better language learners (Grenfell and Harris, 1999).
Based on the notional functional approach in language teaching, the main goal of teaching is to develop a kind of communicative Competence in the learner and language learning strategies can certainly help students to develop such Competence. To develop communicative Competence, one needs to master a series of communication strategies whatever is emphasized in the prominent work of Canale and Swain's (1980) in which they recognized the importance of communication strategies as a key aspect of strategic (and thus communicative) Competence. Oxford (1990, p.37) also believes Language learning strategies including communication strategies "...are especially important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed involvement, which is essential for developing communicative Competence". In addition to developing students' communicative Competence, Language learning strategies are important because research suggests that training students to use LLS can help them become better language learners. Early research on 'good language learners' by Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and Todesco (1978, 1996), Rubin (1975), and Stern (1975) suggested a number of positive strategies that such students employ while learning the language. A study by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) also suggests that good language learners are aware of the Language learning strategies they use and why they use them.

A caution must also be noted though, because, as Skehan (1989, p. 76) states, "there is always the possibility that the 'good' language learning strategies...are also used by bad language learners, but other reasons cause them to be unsuccessful". In fact Vann and Abraham (1990, p. 192) found evidence that suggests that both 'good' and 'unsuccessful' language learners can be active users of similar Language learning strategies, though it is important that they also discovered that their unsuccessful learners "apparently...lacked...what are often called Metacognitive strategies...which would enable them to assess the task and bring to bear the necessary strategies for its completion". It appears, then, that a number of Language learning strategies are important if EFL/ESL teachers are to assist students both in developing communicative Competence and in becoming better language learners.

According to Oxford (2003), If there is harmony between the student (in terms of style and strategy preferences) and the combination of instructional
methodology and materials, then the student is likely to perform well, feel confident, and experience low Angry. If clashes occur between the learner and instructional methodologies, the student often performs poorly, feels unconfident, and experiences significant Angry. Sometimes such clashes lead to serious breakdowns in teacher-student interaction. These conflicts may also lead to the dispirited student’s outright rejection of the teaching methodology, the teacher, and the subject matter.

Learning strategies can also enable students to become more independent, autonomous, and lifelong learners (see Allwright, 1990; little, 1991).

1.6.2 Techniques or Strategies

The same concept of ‘strategy’ as used by Rubin (1975) has been referred to in different famous writers’ works as ‘Techniques, Language behaviors, Tactics, and Strategies’. Many prominent writers have used the term ‘strategies’ like (Rubin1975; O’Malley et al, 1985; Oxford, 1990; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991).

Some others as (Wesche, 1977; Politzer, and McGroarty, 1985) have used ‘Learning behaviors’ to refer to the same concept. Seliger, (1984) uses ‘tactics’ and ‘Techniques’ which are the terms applied by Stern (1992) but in this dissertation, the word strategy is used.

1.6.2.1 Definition of Learning Styles and Strategies

In the domain of language learning, two terms of style and strategies have frequently been used representing two different concepts. As stated in the same chapter, Cognitive domain consists of two facets: human learning processes in general (styles) and Cognitive variations in learning (strategies) which are defined as follows:

A. Styles

Styles are defined as general characteristics that differentiate one individual from another. They refer to consistent and rather enduring tendencies or preferences within an individual. They are also those general characteristics of individual functioning that pertain to you as an individual, like one might be visually oriented,
tolerant of ambiguity and so on. Style is a general pattern in one’s thinking or feeling. However, Brown classifies styles as Cognitive feature, Keefe (1979, p .4) believes that learning styles might be thought of as “Cognitive, Affective, and physiological traits that are relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment”. And Skehan (1991, p. 28), more simply, defines style as “a general predisposition, voluntary or not, toward processing information in a particular way”. Dunn and Griggs (1988, p. 3) see style as a biological feature and define it as: “Learning style is the biologically and developmentally imposed set of characteristics that make the same teaching method wonderful for some and terrible for others”.

B. Strategies

Rubin (1975, p. 42), a pioneer in the theory of language learning strategies, states that strategies are “the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge”. Whatever is called ‘technique or device’ in Rubin’s definition is considered as ‘conscious steps or behaviors’ or ‘operations or steps’ by Rigney and O’Malley et al. When O’Malley et al (1985, p.23) came to conduct their research, they used the definition of learning strategies as being “operations or steps used by a learner that will facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval or use of information” which is a definition originally used by Rigney (1978). Oxford(1990, p.8) whose strategy classification is used in this research as a base for evaluating language learning strategies, defines Language learning strategies as “specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations”. In another paper Scarcella and Oxford, (1992, p.63) define Language learning strategies as “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques –such as seeking out conversation partners, or giving oneself encouragement to tackle a difficult language task -- used by students to enhance their own learning”.

On the other hand, Brown (2000, p.113) defines strategies as: “…specific methods of approaching a problem or task”. He believes that strategies are modes of operation for achieving a particular end or planned designs for controlling and
manipulating certain information. They are contextualized “battle plans” that might vary from moment to moment, or day to day. They vary intra individually.

1.6.3 Learning Strategies versus Communication Strategies

An important distinction exists, however, between communication and language learning strategies. The term Language Learning Strategies is used more generally for all strategies that SL/FL learners use in learning the target language, and communication strategies are therefore just one type of Language Learning Strategies. So, Bialystok (1990) believes that Communication strategies are used by speakers intentionally and consciously in Order to cope with difficulties in communicating in a SL/FL.

Brown (1980, p.87) draws a clear distinction between learning strategies and communication strategies on the grounds that “communication is the output modality and learning is the input modality”. Brown suggests that while a learner generally applies the same fundamental strategies (such as rule transference) used in learning a language to communicating in that language, there are other communication strategies such as avoidance or message abandonment which do not result in learning.

Brown (1994, p.118) concedes, however, that “in the arena of linguistic interaction, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the two”.

1.6.4 The Development of Language Learning Strategy Theory

During the last three decades, many different approaches ,methods and techniques of teaching and learning language to and by speakers of other languages have come and gone in and out of fashion, while each of them had their own theoretical basis, (for instance the grammar-translation method, the audio lingual method, the communicative approach). The researcher tried to analyze the methods and approaches chronologically in Order to find the theoretical basis of language learning strategies as they are increasingly attracting the interest of contemporary educators because of their potential to enhance learning. In the light of this interest, the researcher tried to investigate the theory underlying language learning strategies in theories, methods and approaches from which, and alongside which, language learning strategy theory has developed.
1.6.4.1 The Grammar-Translation Method

However, it was not a scientific-oriented method; Grammar Translation Method can be considered the first language teaching methodology. It was derived from the way Latin and Greek were taught, the grammar-translation method, as its name suggests, relied heavily on the teaching of grammar and practising translation as its main teaching and learning activities. The major focus of this method was reading and writing, with very little attention paid to speaking and listening. Vocabulary was typically taught in lists, and a high priority was given to accuracy and to the ability to construct correct sentences. In general the main purpose of language learning was to enjoy reading and translating complicated literary masterpieces. It was also believed that through learning the second language, memorizing long lists of vocabulary with their equivalents in students’ native language, the learners mind would develop and the learner would get smarter. The dominant language in the classroom was the mother tongue and teacher was the authority and learner played a very minor role, if any, in the classroom and learning event.

The possibility that students might use language learning strategies to promote their own learning had little or no place in the grammar-translation theory, and is rarely if ever mentioned in any literature on the subject, as Tarone and Yule (1989, p.133) point out when they comment “relatively little attention seems to have been paid, in any consistent way, to considerations of the whole process from the learner’s point of view”. Although, there existed some suggestions for how to remember vocabulary lists (mnemonics, grouping, repetition etc) which were quite common in grammar-translation classrooms and can be considered the only Memory strategies which have been applied. Therefore, in GTM learners and Memory strategies are considered important, however, these strategies have just been implied in principles of GTM and they have not been directly mentioned as a principle in this method.

1.6.4.2 The Audio-Lingual Method

After the Second World War, educators tried to apply the method used for urgent training of army officers called army method. So, the audio lingual method grew partly out of a reaction against the limitations of the grammar-translation method, and partly out of the urgent war-time demands for fluent speakers of
languages such as German, Italian and Japanese. The “Army Method” was developed to produce military personnel with conversational proficiency in the target language. After the war, the “Army Method” attracted the attention of linguists already looking for an alternative to grammar-translation and became known as the audio lingual method.

By the sixties, audio-lingualism was widespread (Richards and Rodgers, 1986). In comparison with the grammar-translation method, the audio lingual method was based on the view that oral skills are more important language skills and should be emphasized before written skills (Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992).

This method had a scientific basis as it was based on the findings of behaviorists in learning psychology and it was based on structuralists’ view who considered language as a set of discrete point grammar series which were connected to form the language. Therefore, from one hand behaviorists and on the other hand structuralists’ view provided the building blocks of this method.

According to Richards and Rodgers (1986, p.54), ‘Since Behaviorists’ theory depended on the automatic patterning of behavior there was little or no recognition given to any conscious contribution which the individual learner might make in the learning process. Indeed, learners were discouraged from taking initiative in the learning situation because they might make mistakes’. As a result, there was even less place for individual language learning strategies in audio lingual theory than there had been in grammar-translation theory, except, perhaps, in a very limited form in the exercising of Memory and Cognitive strategies by means of repetition and substitution exercises, and even this was rarely, if ever, made explicit . Stern (1992, p.14) states ‘The effect of audio lingual techniques of rote learning, repetition, imitation, memorization and pattern practice was to minimize the importance of explicit learning strategies in the language learning process’.

1.6.4.3. Noam Chomsky’s Universal Grammar (UG)

In the mid to late sixties, the ideas of the highly influential linguist, Chomsky began to have a major effect on linguistic theory. Chomsky (1965; 1968) postulated that all normal human beings are born with a Language Acquisition Device (LAD) which enables them to develop language from an innate set of principles which he called the Universal Grammar (UG).
Chomsky’s theory of Transformational-Generative Grammar attempts to explain how original utterances are generated from a language user’s underlying Competence. Chomsky (1968, p.84) believed that behaviorist theory could not explain the complexities of generative grammar and concluded that “the creative aspect of language use, when investigated with care and respect for the facts, shows that current notions of habit and generalization, as determinants of behavior or knowledge, are quite inadequate”.

Although Chomsky’s theories directly related mainly to first language learners, his view of the learner as a generator of rules was taken up by COrder (1967) who argued that language errors made by students who are speakers of other languages indicate the development of underlying linguistic Competence and reflect the learners’ attempts to organize linguistic input. The intermediate system created while the learner is trying to come to terms with the target language was later called “interlanguage” (IL) by Selinker (1972) who viewed learner errors as evidence of positive efforts by the student to learn the new language. According to Griffiths(2003, p. 37), “This view of language learning allowed for the possibility of learners making deliberate attempts to control their own learning” and, along with theories of Cognitive processes in language learning promoted by writers such as McLaughlin (1978) and Bialystok (1978), contributed to a research thrust in the mid to late seventies aimed at discovering how learners employ learning strategies to promote the learning of language (for instance Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975; Naiman, Frohlich, Stern and Todesco, 1978). The idea that teachers should be concerned not only with “finding the best method or with getting the correct answer” but also with assisting a student in Order to “enable him to learn on his own” (Rubin 1975, p.45) was, at the time, quite revolutionary.

1.6.4.4 Krashen’s Five Hypotheses

Krashen (1977) proposed his five hypotheses just the time when researchers like Rubin, Stern and Naiman et al. were working to develop an awareness of language learning strategies, and challenged the rule which controlled theories of GTM and ALM. Krashen’s five hypotheses consist of the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis (conscious learning is an ineffective way of developing language, which is better acquired through natural communication), the Natural Order Hypothesis
grammatical structures of a language are acquired in a predictable Order), the Monitor Hypothesis (conscious learning is of very little value to an adult language learner, and can only be useful under certain conditions as a monitor or editor), the Input Hypothesis (language is acquired by understanding input which is a little beyond the current level of Competence (comprehensible input)) and the Affective Filter Hypothesis (a learner’s emotions and attitudes can act as a filter which slows down the acquisition of language. When the Affective filter is high it can block language development).

Krashen’s hypotheses suggested that conscious teaching and learning were not useful in the language learning process, and that any attempt to teach or learn language in a formal kind of a way was doomed to failure. Therefore, since in Krashen’s view conscious learning had so little value, there was very little room for conscious language learning strategies to play a role in the process of language development. But McLaughlin (1978) from a Cognitive psychologist’s point of view, proposed an information-processing approach to language development whereby students can obtain knowledge of a language by thinking through the rules until they become automatic, and this view was against the assertions of the Monitor Hypothesis. It was in a way supporting the role of learner and language learning strategies.

However the hypotheses of Krashen were criticized by McLaughlin (1978) and (Gregg, 1984), yet based on (Gregg, 1984), he might be considered one of the driving forces behind the communicative language teaching movement which is in vogue to the present day.

1.6.4.5 Communicative Language Teaching Movement

An important theoretical principle underlying the communicative language teaching movement was called “communicative Competence” by Hymes (1972).

Communicative Competence is the ability to use language to convey and interpret meaning. Widdowson (1978, p.160) believes that by using a communicative approach language can be developed incidentally, as a by-product of using it, and that “knowing will emerge from doing”. While Littlewood (1981) stresses the need to give learners extensive opportunities to use the target language for real
communicative purposes, and believes that the ability to communicate effectively is more important than perfect mastery.

1.6.4.6 Other Teaching and Learning Methods and Approaches

There are some other language teaching and learning methods and approaches which are less widely adopted such as situational language teaching (whereby grammar and vocabulary are practised through situations), the natural method (which emphasizes natural acquisition rather than formal grammar study), the direct method (which uses only the target language), the total physical response method (which stresses the importance of motor Activity), the silent way (which encourages the teacher to be silent as much as possible) and suggestopedia (which attempts to harness the influence of suggestion, such as music or art, on human behavior).

Nowadays educators are no more interested in methods and approaches as fixed plans for teaching, and they are looking for more flexible methods in the form of eclectic schedule. In line with this modern interest in eclecticism, educators are becoming increasingly interested in the contribution made by the learners themselves in the teaching/learning partnership. Awareness has been slowly growing for some time that “any learning is an active process” (Rivers, 1983, p.134.), and the idea that language learners are individuals who can take charge of their own learning and achieve autonomy by the use of learning strategies has been researched and promoted by educators such as Oxford (1990), O’Malley and Chamot (1990), Bialystok (1991), Cohen (1991), Wenden (1991), and Green and Oxford (1995). There are several important theoretical assumptions which underlie contemporary ideas on language learning strategies.

1.6.5 Language Learning Strategy Theory

According to McLaughlin (1978), Language learning strategy theory postulates that other things being equal, at least part of this differential success rate is attributable to the varying strategies which different learners bring to the task. From this perspective, which views students as being able to consciously influence their own learning, the learning of language becomes a Cognitive process similar in many ways to any other kind of learning.
With the exception of the Monitor and Acquisition/Learning Hypotheses, language learning strategy theory operates comfortably alongside most of the contemporary language learning and teaching theories and fits easily with a wide variety of different methods and approaches. For instance, Memory and Cognitive strategies are involved in the development of vocabulary and grammar knowledge on which the grammar translation method depends. Memory and Cognitive strategies can be involved to make the patterning of automatic responses characteristic of the audio-lingual method more effective. Learning from errors (developed from interlanguage theory) involves Cognitive and Metacognitive strategies. Compensation and Social strategies can easily be assimilated into communicative Competence theory and the communicative language teaching approach. Methods such as suggestopedia involve Affective strategies. The fact that learning strategy theory can work so easily alongside other theories, methods and approaches means that it has the potential to be a valuable component of contemporary eclectic syllabuses.

1.6.6 Features of Language Learning Strategies

Oxford (1990, p.9) claims that language learning strategies have the following features:

1. Contribute to the main goal, communicative Competence.
2. Allow learners to become more self-directed.
3. Expand the role of the teachers.
5. Are specific actions taken by the learner.
6. Involve many aspects of the learner, not just the Cognitive.
7. Support learning both directly and indirectly.
8. Are not always observable.
9. Are often conscious.
10. Can be taught.
11. Are flexible.
12. Are influenced by a variety of factors.

1.7 Conditions for Language Learning Strategies

Oxford (1990, p. 8) mentions a number of conditions for language learning strategies to be effective. A strategy is useful if the following conditions are present:
(a) the strategy relates well to the L2 task at hand, (b) the strategy fits the particular student’s learning style preferences to one degree or another, and (c) the student employs the strategy effectively and links it with other relevant strategies. She believes strategies that fulfill these conditions “make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations”.

1.8 Taxonomy of Language Learning Strategies

Language Learning Strategies have been classified by many scholars (Wenden and Rubin 1987; O'Malley et al. 1985; Oxford 1990; Stern 1992; Ellis 1994, etc.). However, most of these attempts to classify language learning strategies reflect more or less the same categorizations of language learning strategies without any radical changes. In what follows, Rubin's (1987), O'Malley's (1985), Stern's (1992), and Oxford's (1990) taxonomies of language learning strategies will be handled.

1.8. 1 Rubin's (1987) Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Rubin, who pioneered much of the work in the field of strategies, makes the distinction between strategies contributing directly to learning and those contributing indirectly to learning. According to Rubin, there are three types of strategies used by learners that contribute directly or indirectly to language learning. These are:

- Learning Strategies
- Communication Strategies
- Social Strategies

1.8. 1.1 Learning Strategies

Learning strategies are of two main types which contribute directly to the development of the language system constructed by the learner:

- Cognitive Learning Strategies
- Metacognitive Learning Strategies
A. Cognitive Learning Strategies

They refer to the steps or operations used in learning or problem-solving that requires direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. Rubin identified 6 main Cognitive learning strategies contributing directly to language learning:

- Clarification / Verification
- Guessing / Inductive Inferencing
- Deductive Reasoning
- Practice
- Memorization
- Monitoring

B. Metacognitive Learning Strategies

These strategies are used to oversee, regulate or self-direct language learning. They involve various processes as planning, prioritizing, setting goals, and self-management.

1.8.1.2 Communication Strategies

They are less directly related to language learning since their focus is on the process of participating in a conversation and getting meaning across or clarifying what the speaker intended. Communication strategies are used by speakers when faced with some difficulty due to the fact that their communication ends outrun their communication means or when confronted with misunderstanding by a co-speaker.

1.8.1.3 Social Strategies

Social strategies are those activities learners engage in which afford them opportunities to be exposed to and practise their knowledge. Although these strategies provide exposure to the target language, they contribute indirectly to learning since they do not lead directly to the obtaining, storing, retrieving, and using of language (Wenden and Rubin 1987).
1.8.2 O'Malley's (1985) Classification of Language Learning Strategies

O'Malley et al. (1985) divide language learning strategies into three main subcategories:

- Meta-Cognitive Strategies
- Cognitive Strategies
- Socio-Affective Strategies

1.8.2.1 Metacognitive Strategies

It can be stated that Metacognitive is a term to express executive function, strategies which require planning for learning, thinking about the learning process as it is taking place, monitoring of one's production or comprehension, and evaluating learning after an Activity is completed. Among the main Metacognitive strategies, it is possible to include advance organizers, directed attention, selective attention, self-management, functional planning, self-monitoring, delayed production, and self-evaluation.

1.8.2.2 Cognitive Strategies

Cognitive strategies are more limited to specific learning tasks and they involve more direct manipulation of the learning material itself. Repetition, resourcing, translation, grouping, note taking, deduction, recombination, imagery, auditory representation, key word, contextualization, elaboration, transfer, inferencing are among the most important Cognitive strategies.

1.8.2.3 Socio-Affective Strategies

As to the socio-Affective strategies, it can be stated that they ‘...are related with Social-mediating Activity and transacting with others. Cooperation and question for clarification are the main socio-Affective strategies’ (Brown 1987, pp. 93-94).

1.8.3 Stern's (1992) Classification of Language Learning Strategies

According to Stern (1992), there are five main language learning strategies. These are as follows:
• Management and Planning Strategies
• Cognitive Strategies
• Communicative - Experiential Strategies
• Interpersonal Strategies
• Affective Strategies

1.8.3.1 Management and Planning Strategies

These strategies are related with the learner's intention to direct his own learning. A learner can take charge of the development of his own program when he is helped by a teacher whose role is that of an adviser and resource person. That is to say that the learner must:

• Decide what commitment to make to language learning
• Set himself reasonable goals
• Decide on an appropriate methodology, select appropriate resources, and monitor progress,
• Evaluate his achievement in the light of previously determined goals and expectations.

1.8.3.2 Cognitive Strategies

They are steps or operations used in learning or problem solving that require direct analysis, transformation, or synthesis of learning materials. In the following, some of the Cognitive strategies are exhibited:

• Clarification / Verification
• Guessing / Inductive Inferencing
• Deductive Reasoning
• Practice
• Memorization
• Monitoring
1.8.3.3 Communicative - Experiential Strategies

Communication strategies, such as circumlocution, gesturing, paraphrase, or asking for repetition and explanation are techniques used by learners so as to keep a conversation going. The purpose of using these techniques is to avoid interrupting the flow of communication.

1.8.3.4 Interpersonal Strategies

They should monitor their own development and evaluate their own performance. Learners should contact with native speakers and cooperate with them. Learners must become acquainted with the target culture.

1.8.3.5 Affective Strategies

It is evident that good language learners employ distinct Affective strategies. Language learning can be frustrating in some cases. In some cases, the feeling of strangeness can be evoked by the foreign language. In some other cases, L2 learners may have negative Feelings about native speakers of L2. Good language learners are more or less conscious of these emotional problems. Good language learners try to create associations of positive affect towards the foreign language and its speakers as well as towards the learning activities involved. Learning training can help students to face up to the emotional difficulties and to overcome them by drawing attention to the potential frustrations or pointing them out as they arise.

1.8.4 Oxford's (1990) Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Oxford (1990) sees the aim of language learning strategies as being oriented towards the development of communicative Competence. Oxford divides language learning strategies into two main classes, direct and indirect, which are further subdivided into 6 groups. In Oxford's system, Memory strategies are those used for storage of information, Cognitive strategies are the mental strategies learners use to make sense of their learning, and Compensation strategies help learners to overcome knowledge gaps to continue the communication. Metacognitive strategies help learners to regulate their learning. Affective strategies are concerned with the learner's emotional requirements such as confidence, while Social strategies lead to increased
interaction with the target language. Oxford's (1990) taxonomy of language learning strategies is as follows:

A. Direct Strategies

Direct strategies include Memory, Cognitive and Compensation strategies.

- Memory are like Creating mental linkages, Applying images and sounds, Reviewing well and Employing action.

- Cognitive are like Practicing, Receiving and sending messages strategies, Analyzing and reasoning and Creating structure for input and output.

- Compensation strategies are like guessing intelligently and Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing.

B. Indirect Strategies

Indirect strategies include Metacognitive, Affective and Social strategies.

- Metacognitive Strategies are like Centering your learning, Arranging and planning your learning, and Evaluating your learning.

- Affective Strategies are like lowering your Angry, Encouraging yourself and Taking your emotional temperature.

- Social Strategies are like Asking questions, Cooperating with others and Empathizing with others.

These strategies can be specified as follows: 1) Memory strategies for remembering and retrieving new information. 2) Cognitive strategies for understanding and producing the language. 3) Compensation strategies for using the language despite lack of knowledge. 4) Metacognitive strategies for coordinating the learning process. 5) Affective strategies for regulating emotions. 6) Social strategies for learning with others (Oxford, 1990, pp. 14-15). These six broad strategies include
nineteen secondary strategies with a further sixty-two specific strategies and lay the fundamentals of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford, 1990).

Based on this complete list of strategies, Oxford (1990) developed SILL, which is a useful instrument designed to test ESL/EFL learners’ strategy use. Compared with earlier research into language learning strategies, Oxford’s (1990) classification of language learning strategies is more comprehensive and detailed.

Recent studies (Ehrman and Oxford, 1989; Oxford and Nyikos, 1989; Phillips, 1991; Green, 1991) applying the SILL claimed that using language learning strategies would have valuable influence on language proficiency.

It can be seen that much of the recent work in this area has been underpinned by a broad concept of language learning strategies that goes beyond Cognitive processes to include Social and communicative strategies.

1.9 How are Personality and Language Acquisition Related?

In Order to engage in a discussion of personality and language learning, one has to explain its neurological bases first. Significant advances in the empirical study of the brain through Positron Emission Tomography (PET) and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) enabled researchers to find connections between language acquisition and Affectivity. According to Brown (2000, p.143), Affectivity can be defined as: “Affect refers to emotion or feeling. The Affective domain is the emotional side of human behavior, and it may be juxtaposed to the Cognitive side”. John Schumann’s (1999) found some connections between affectivity and mental, emotional processing in general and second language acquisition in particular. His work in this area has singled out one section of the temporal lobes of the human brain, the Amygdale, as a major player in relationship of affect to language learning. When one hears, sees, or tastes something, amygdale sends signals to brain. These signals can be negative, neutral, or positive. Schumann (1999, p.32) concludes that “positive appraisals of the language learning situation ….enhance language learning and negative appraisals inhibit second language learning”. In this study, the researcher hypothesizes that there are important connections between personality factors and second language
acquisition. So, the following sections give the details on psychology in general and personality factors in particular.

### 1.9.1 Educational Psychology and School Psychology

Educational psychology is the study of how humans learn in educational settings, the effectiveness of educational interventions, the psychology of teaching, and the Social psychology of schools as organizations. The work of child psychologists such as Lev Vygotsky, Jean Piaget, Bernard Luskin and Jerome Bruner has been influential in creating teaching methods and educational practices. Educational psychology is often included in teacher education programs, in places such as North America, Australia, and New Zealand.

School psychology combines principles from educational psychology and clinical psychology to understand and treat students with learning disabilities; to foster the intellectual growth of gifted students; to facilitate proSocial behaviors in adolescents; and otherwise to promote safe, supportive, and effective learning environments.

### 1.9.2 Personality Psychology

Personality psychology is concerned to enduring patterns of behavior, thought, and emotion in individuals, commonly referred to as personality. Trait theorists attempt to analyze personality in terms of a discrete number of key traits by the statistical method of factor analysis.

### 1.9.3 Personality Models

The evaluation of individual personality is important to know individual performance in different situations (Hardie and Tee, 2007). One of the most recent models for studying personality is the five-factor model (FFM). In recent years, the five-factor model has become the dominant model in dispositional trait psychology. Many factor-analytic theorists believe that there are five to eight elements that determined our personality (McCrae and Costa, 1987).
The five-factor model has emerged as an alternative robust description of personality traits in the last two decades of 20\textsuperscript{th} century and by now it has become a cardinal personality approach (McCrae and Allik, 2002; McCrae, Terracciano and 79 Member of personality profiles of Cultures Project, 2005). The psychometric work by Costa and McCrae (1992) employing the NEO-PI-R has made significant contribution towards the five factor model, and it has become probably the most important personality trait model. The personality traits used in this study are Neuroticism, extraversion, Openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness.

1.9.4 Various Definitions of Personality

The word "personality" originates from the Latin term ‘persona’, which means 'mask'. In ancient Latin the mask was used to represent or typify character. According to Adams (1954, cited in Schultz and Schultz, 1994) personality is ‘I’. Adams suggested that we get a good idea of what personality is by listening to what we say when we use "I". When one says I, he is, in effect, summing up everything about himself – his likes and dislikes, fears and virtues, strengths and weaknesses.

According to Smith and Vetter, (1982, p.5), "Personality is not an existing substantive entity to be searched for but a complex constructs to be developed and defined by the observer".

According to Larsen and Buss, (2002, p. 8), “The personality of an individual can be described as a set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the individual which are organized and relatively enduring and influence his or her interactions with, and adoptions to, the environment (including the intrapsychic, physical and Social environments)”.

Personality is a concept that has been used to recognize stability and consistency of behavior in different situations, uniqueness of the individuals and personal differences. Personality can be defined as a dynamic and organized set of characteristics possessed by a person that uniquely influences his or her cognitions, motivations, and behaviors in various situations (Haghshenas, 2006).
A contemporary definition for personality is offered by Carver and Scheier (2000, p.5): “Personality is a dynamic organization, inside the person, of psychophysical systems that create a person’s characteristic patterns of behavior, thoughts, and Feelings”. They also suggest that the word personality conveys a sense of consistency, internal causality, and personal distinctiveness.

Therefore, based on the given definitions, Personality can be defined as a dynamic and organized set of characteristics possessed by a person that uniquely influences his or her cognitions, motivations, and behaviors in various situations. The study of personality can be understood, then, as the study of masks that people wear. These are the personas that people project and display, but also include the inner parts of psychological experience which we collectively call our self.

The pioneering American psychologist Gordon Allport (1937) described two major ways to study personality: the nomothetic and the idiographic. Nomothetic psychology seeks general laws that can be applied to many different people, such as the principle of self-actualization, or the trait of extraversion. Idiographic psychology is an attempt to understand the unique aspects of a particular individual.

1.9.5 Affectivity

Affectivity is defined as: “…emotion or feeling. The Affective domain is the emotional side of human behavior, and it may be juxtaposed to the Cognitive side” Brown (2000, p143). He also believes that the development of Affective states or Feelings involves a variety of personality factors.

1.9.6 Personality Types or Traits

Personality types and traits have been used interchangeably but there exist a difference. Personality type refers to the psychological classification of different types of people. Personality types are distinguished from personality traits, which come in different levels or degrees. For example, according to type theories, there are two types of people, introverts and extraverts. According to trait theories, introversion and extraversion are part of a continuous dimension.
Personality traits are consistently found (across people and over time) dimensions of thinking, behavior and feeling allow people individuals to be placed in a continuum with respect to different traits (e.g., introversion-extraversion, Neuroticism-emotional stability).

1.9.7 Personality Tests

There are two major types of personality tests. A) Projective tests assume personality is primarily unconscious and assess an individual by how he or she responds to an ambiguous stimulus, like an ink blot. The idea of unconscious needs will come out in the person's response, e.g. an aggressive person may see images of destruction. B) Objective tests assume personality is consciously accessible and measure it by self-report questionnaires. Research on psychological assessment has generally found objective tests are more valid and reliable than projective tests.

In the following part a number of different classifications of personality traits are presented which consider traits in different ways. Some of the psychologists have devised personality tests based on their classification which are also presented. Cattle, Fiske, Tupes and Christal, Goldberg, Wiggins, and McCrae and Costa’s Classification are discussed in the following parts and the related tests are described.

1.9.7.1 Cattle’s Classification of Personality Traits

Cattell (1943) used the Allport and Odbert’s (1936) list as a starting point for his multidimensional model of personality structure. Because the size of that list was too overwhelming for research purposes, he began with the subset of 4,500 trait terms. Using both semantic and empirical clustering procedures as well as his own reviews of the personological literature available at the time , Cattell reduced the 4,500 trait terms to a mere 35 variables.

Using this small set of variables, Cattell conducted several oblique factor analyses and concluded that he had identified 12 personality factors, which eventually became part of his 16 Personality Factors (16PF) questionnaire (Cattell, Eber, and Tatsuoka, 1970).
Cattell’s Early Efforts provided some initial structure for the personality lexicon. According to Cattell, there is a continuum of personality traits. In other words, each person contains all of these 16 traits to a certain degree, but they might be high in some traits and low in others. The following personality trait list describes some of the descriptive terms used for each of the 16 personality dimensions described by Cattell.

1. **Abstractedness**: Imaginative versus practical
2. **Apprehension**: Worried versus confident
3. **Dominance**: Forceful versus submissive
4. **Emotional Stability**: Calm versus high strung
5. **Liveliness**: Spontaneous versus restrained
6. **Openness to Change**: Flexible versus attached to the familiar
7. **Perfectionism**: Controlled versus undisciplined
8. **Privateness**: Discreet versus open
9. **Reasoning**: Abstract versus concrete
10. **Rule Consciousness**: Conforming versus non-conforming
11. **Self-Reliance**: Self-sufficient versus dependent
12. **Sensitivity**: Tender-hearted versus tough-minded.
13. **Social Boldness**: Uninhibited versus shy
14. **Tension**: Impatient versus relaxed
15. **Vigilance**: Suspicious versus Trusting
16. **Warmth**: Outgoing versus reserved

Cattell developed an assessment based on these 16 personality factors. The test is known as the 16 PF Personality Questionnaire and is still frequently used today especially in business for employee testing and selection, career counseling and marital counseling. The test is composed of forced-choice questions in which the respondent must choose one of three different alternatives. Personality traits are then represented by a range and the individuals score falls somewhere on the continuum between highest and lowest extremes.
1.9.7.2 Fiske’s Classification

Cattell's pioneering work, and the availability of a relatively short list of variables, stimulated other researchers to examine the dimensional structure of trait ratings. Several investigators were involved in the discovery and clarification of the Big Five dimensions. Fiske (1949) was the first to discover that five, not sixteen, factors accounted for the variance in personality trait descriptors. He constructed much simplified descriptions from 22 of Cattell's variables; the factor structures derived from self-ratings, ratings by peers, and ratings by psychological staff members were highly similar and resembled what would be later known as the Big Five.

1.9.7.3 Tupes and Christal’s Classification

To clarify these factors, Tupes and Christal (1961) reanalyzed correlation matrices from eight different samples, ranging from airmen with no more than high-school education to first-year graduate students, and included ratings by peers, supervisors, teachers, or experienced clinicians in settings as diverse as military training courses and sorority houses. In all the analyses, Tupes and Christal (1961) found five relatively strong and recurrent factors and nothing more of any consequence.

Norman (1963) initially labeled These five-factor as:

a) Extraversion or Surgency (talkative, assertive, energetic)
b) Agreeableness (good-natured, cooperative, Trustful)
c) Conscientiousness (Orderly, responsible, dependable)
d) Emotional Stability versus Neuroticism (calm, not neurotic, not easily upset)
e) Culture (intellectual, polished, independent-minded)

These factors later on became known as the “Big Five” (Goldberg, 1981). This title was selected not to merely show their intrinsic greatness but to emphasize that each of these factors is extremely broad. Therefore, the Big Five structure does not imply that personality traits can be reduced to only five. Rather, these five dimensions show personality at the broadest level of abstraction, and each aspect summarizes a large number of distinct, more specific personality traits.
1.9.7.4 Goldberg’s Classification

Goldberg (1992) published his extensive taxonomic findings into several adjective lists. One of them is a 50-item instrument using the so-called transparent format which is not used frequently for research but is excellent for instructional purposes. For each factor, this measure presents 10 bipolar adjective scales (e.g., quiet-talkative) grouped together under the factor name, thus making the constructs being measured transparent to the research participants. The list which is used more commonly in research is the set of 100 unipolar trait descriptive adjectives (TDA). Goldberg (1992) conducted a series of factor analytic studies to develop and refine the TDA as an optimal representation of the five-factor space in English, selecting for each Big Five scale only those adjectives that uniquely defined that factor. These scales have impressively high internal consistency, and their factor structure is easily replicated.

1.9.7.5 Wiggins’s Classification

Another adjectival measure of the Big Five was developed by Wiggins (1995). In his 20-year program of research on the interpersonal circumplex, Wiggins (1979) has used personality trait adjectives to elaborate both the conception and the measurement of the two major dimensions of interpersonal behavior, dominance (or agency) and nurturance (or communion). Noting that the first dimension closely resembles the Extraversion factor in the Big Five, and the second dimension the Agreeableness factor, Wiggins extended his circumplex scales by adding adjective measures for the other three of the Big Five factors (Trapnell and Wiggins, 1990). The resulting Interpersonal Adjective Scales (Wiggins, 1995) have excellent reliabilities and converge well with other measures; they have been used by researchers who want to measure the specific octants of the interpersonal circle as well as the Big Five.

1.9.7.6 McCrae and Costa’s Classification, the Revised NEO Personality Inventory

The initial NEO Personality Inventory (Costa and McCrae, 1985) included scales to measure the facets of Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Openness but did not include facet scales for the newly added Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. In 1992, Costa and McCrae published the 240-item NEO Personality Inventory, Revised
(NEO PI-R; Costa and McCrae, 1992) which permits differentiated measurement of each Big Five dimension in terms of six more specific facets per factor (Costa and McCrae, 1995).

For many research applications, the NEO PI-R is rather lengthy. To provide a shorter measure, Costa and McCrae (1992) developed the 60-item NEO-FFI, an abbreviated version based on an item factor analysis of the 1985 version of the NEO PI (Costa and McCrae, 1985). The 12-item scales of the FFI include the items 17 that loaded most highly on each of the five factors in that analysis.

The reliabilities reported in the manual (Costa and McCrae, 1992) are adequate, with a mean of .78 across the five factors. The NEO-FFI scales are substantially correlated with the NEO PI-R scales, suggesting that they inherit a substantial portion of the validity of the longer scales.

In general, the NEO questionnaires represent the best-validated Big Five measures in the questionnaire tradition. Finally, the BFI has been used frequently in research settings where subject time is at a premium and its short-phrase item format provides more context than Goldberg’s single adjective items but less complexity than the sentence format used by the NEO questionnaires.

1.9.8 The Five Factors

The Big Five factors and their constituent traits can be summarized as (OCEAN): Openness to experience or inventive/curious vs. consistent/cautious which contains Appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, curiosity, and variety of experience.

Conscientiousness or efficient/organized vs. easy-going/careless which consists a tendency to show Self-Discipline, act dutifully, aim for achievement and planned rather than spontaneous behaviour.

Extroversion or outgoing/energetic vs. solitary/reserved which involves Energy, positive emotions, surgency, and the tendency to seek stimulation in the company of others.
Agreeableness or friendly/compassionate vs. cold/unkind which includes a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others.

Neuroticism or sensitive/nervous vs. secure/confident which involves a tendency to experience unpleasant emotions easily, such as anger, Angry, Depression, or Vulnerability.

1.9.8.1 Openness to Experience

Openness to Experience describes a dimension of Cognitive style that distinguishes imaginative and creative people from down-to-earth and conventional people. Openness is a general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination, curiosity, and variety of experience. Open people are intellectually curious, appreciative of art and sensitive to beauty. They tend to be, compared to closed people, more aware of their Feelings. They tend to think and act in individualistic and nonconforming ways.

'Intellectuals' typically score high on Openness to Experience; consequently, this factor has also been called Culture or Intellect. Nonetheless, Intellect is probably best regarded as one aspect of Openness to Experience. Scores on Openness to Experience are only modestly related to years of education and scores on standard intelligent tests.

People with low scores on Openness to Experience tend to have narrow, common interests. They prefer the plain, straightforward and obvious over the complex, ambiguous and subtle. They may regard the arts and sciences with suspicion, regarding these endeavors as obscure or of no practical use. Closed people prefer familiarity over novelty; they are conservative and resistant to change.

Openness is often perceived as healthier or more mature. However, both open and closed styles of thinking are useful in different environments. The intellectual style of the open person may serve as educator or strategist well. However, research has shown that closed thinking is related to superior job performance in police work, sales and a number of service occupations.
Sample Openness items are as follows:

- I have a rich vocabulary.
- I have a vivid imagination.
- I have excellent ideas.
- I am quick to understand things.
- I use difficult words.
- I spend time reflecting on things.
- I am full of ideas.
- I am not interested in abstractions. (reversed)
- I do not have a good imagination. (reversed)
- I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas. (reversed)

1.9.8.2 Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness concerns the way in which we control, regulate and direct our impulses. Impulses are not inherently bad; occasionally time constraints require a snap decision and acting on our first impulse can be an effective response. Also, in times of play rather than work, acting spontaneously and impulsively can be fun. Impulsive individuals can be seen by others as colorful, fun-to-be-with and zany.

The benefits of high conscientiousness are obvious. Conscientious individuals avoid trouble and achieve high levels of success through purposeful planning and persistence. They are also positively regarded by others as intelligent and reliable. On the negative side, they can be compulsive perfectionists and workaholics. Furthermore, extremely conscientious individuals might be regarded as stuffy and boring. People who are lacking in conscientiousness may be criticized for their unreliability, lack of ambition and failure to stay within the lines, but they will experience many short-lived pleasures and they will never be called stuffy.
Like extroversion, conscientiousness is an aspect of intra-relations tendencies. Basically, a compromised person likes charity and sympathizes with others. He or she tends to help others and believes that others are helpful too. People with high score on this factor are Trustful, frank, friendly, sociable, humble and merciful.

Conscientiousness is a tendency to show Self-Discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement against measures or outside expectations. The trait shows a preference for planned rather than spontaneous behavior. It influences the way in which we control, regulate, and direct our impulses.

Sample conscientiousness items:

- I am always prepared.
- I pay attention to details.
- I get chores done right away.
- I like Order.
- I follow a schedule.
- I am exacting in my work.
- I leave my belongings around. (reversed)
- I make a mess of things. (reversed)
- I often forget to put things back in their proper place. (reversed)
- I shirk my duties. (reversed)

1.9.8.3 Extraversion

Extraversion is marked by pronounced engagement with the external world. Extraverts enjoy being with people, are full of energy and often experience positive emotions. They tend to be enthusiastic and action-oriented individuals who are likely to say "Yes!" or "Let's go!" to opportunities for excitement. In groups they like to talk, assert themselves and draw attention to themselves.
Introverts lack the exuberance, energy and Activity levels of extraverts. They tend to be quiet, low-key, deliberate and disengaged from the Social world. However, their lack of Social involvement should not be interpreted as shyness or Depression; the introvert simply needs less stimulation than an extravert and prefers to be alone. The independence and reserve of the introvert is sometimes mistaken as unfriendliness or arrogance.

Social behavior is the feature of extrovert people. Extroversion on one hand indicates interest toward people, preferring big groups, risk taking behavior, high Activity, excitements and optimism. On other hand it indicates reserved, shy, withdrawn attitude of people (Need and De Jong 2007).

Extraversion is characterized by positive emotions, surgency, and the tendency to seek out stimulation and the company of others.

Sample extraversion items are as follows:

- I am the life of the party.
- I don't mind being the center of attention.
- I feel comfortable around people.
- I start conversations.
- I talk to a lot of different people at parties.
- I don't talk a lot. (reversed)
- I keep in the background. (reversed)
- I have little to say. (reversed)
- I don't like to draw attention to myself. (reversed)
- I am quiet around strangers. (reversed)
1.9.8.4 Agreeableness

Agreeableness reflects individual differences in concern about co-operation and Social harmony. Agreeable individuals value getting along with others. They are therefore considerate, friendly, generous, helpful and willing to compromise their interests with others. Agreeable people also have an optimistic view of human nature. They believe people are basically honest, decent and Trustworthy.

People who score low in this area place self-interest above getting along with others. They are generally unconcerned with others' well-being and therefore are unlikely to extend themselves for other people. Sometimes their scepticism about others' motives causes them to be suspicious, unfriendly and uncooperative.

Agreeableness is obviously advantageous for attaining and maintaining popularity. Agreeable people are better liked than disagreeable people. On the other hand, agreeableness is not useful in situations that require tough or absolute objective decisions. Low scorers can make excellent scientists, critics, or soldiers.

This factor is related to those people who believe that beauty is in duty. Their best feature is their will. These people have will, goal, humanity and seriousness. The high score of this class will guarantee the success in education and occupation. These people are punctual, faithful, careful, responsible, and Trustful.

Agreeableness is a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others. The trait reflects individual differences in general concern for Social harmony.

Sample agreeableness items are as follows:

- I am interested in people.
- I sympathize with others' Feelings.
- I have a soft heart.
- I take time out for others.
- I feel others' emotions.
1. I make people feel at ease.

2. I am not really interested in others. (reversed)

3. I insult people. (reversed)

4. I am not interested in other people's problems. (reversed)

5. I feel little concern for others. (reversed)

### 1.9.8.5 Neuroticism

People high in Natural Reactions are emotionally reactive. They respond emotionally to events that do not affect a lot of people and their reactions tend to be more intense. They are more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult. Their negative emotional reactions tend to persist for unusually long periods of time. These problems can diminish a person's ability to think clearly, make decisions and cope effectively with stress.

At the other end of the scale, individuals who score low in Natural Reactions are less easily upset and are less emotionally reactive. They tend to be calm, relaxed and rarely experience negative Feelings. Freedom from negative Feelings does not necessarily mean that low scorers experience a lot of positive Feelings, (frequency of positive emotions is measured by a facet of the Extraversion factor).

According to Lansbury, Sodergass, Gibson and Leong (2005), Neuroticism is a feature of personality that indicates the stability of emotion and low Angry is on one hand and on the other hand it indicates instability of emotion and high Angry. Men and women with high score of Neuroticism have more illogical emotions and disability in restricting motivating behaviors and weakness in coping with problems. Person with low score of Neuroticism are emotional, usually calm, mediocre, and easy going and they are able to cope with perplex conditions without any stress or Angry.

Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, Angry, or Depression. It is sometimes called emotional instability. Those who score high in Neuroticism are emotionally reactive and vulnerable to stress.
Sample Neuroticism items are:

- I am easily disturbed.
- I change my mood a lot.
- I get irritated easily.
- I get stressed out easily.
- I get upset easily.
- I have frequent mood swings.
- I often feel blue.
- I worry about things.
- I am relaxed most of the time. (reversed)

1.9.9 Facets of Personality Traits

Each personality trait is further sub classified into facets. Each of the big 5 personality traits is made up of 6 facets or sub traits. These can be assessed independently of the trait that they belong to. They are also called Subordinate Personality Traits.
Table 1-1 Personality traits and Facets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Facets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Friendliness(Warmth-outgoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gregariousness(sociable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertiveness(forceful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity Level(energetic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excitement-Seeking(adventurous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheerfulness(enthusiastic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Trust(forgiving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morality(Straightforwardness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altruism(warm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation(Compliance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modesty(not show off)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathy(Tender-mindedness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy(Competence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orderliness(Order, organized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dutifulness(not careless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement-Striving(through)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Discipline(not lazy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cautiousness(Deliberation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Angry(tense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anger(irritable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depression(not contended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Consciousness(shy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immoderation(moody-Impulsiveness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vulnerability(not self-confident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>Imagination(fantasy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic Interests(Aesthetics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotionality(actions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adventurousness(ideas-curious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellect(Feelings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberalism (Values-unconventional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These traits from the Adjective check list (listed in parentheses following each facet) correlated substantially with scores on the facet in a study of self-ratings (Costa and McCrae, 1992).

1. Facets of Extraversion vs. Introversion

Extroversion consist of six facets including Friendliness, Gregariousness, Assertiveness, Activity Level, Excitement-Seeking, and Cheerfulness.
A. Warmth (Alpha=.87)

Warmth is a facet of Extraversion personality trait which is also called Outgoing or Friendliness facet as they have been correlated substantially with scores on the facet of Warmth in a study of self-ratings (Costa and McCrae, 1992.). Friendly people genuinely like other people and openly demonstrate positive Feelings toward others. They make friends quickly and it is easy for them to form close, intimate relationships. Low scorers on Friendliness are not necessarily cold and hostile, but they do not reach out to others and are perceived as distant and reserved.

Some of the items which test the friendliness are as follows:

+ keyed
Make friends easily.
Warm up quickly to others.
Feel comfortable around people.
Act comfortably with others.
Cheer people up.

– keyed
Am hard to get to know.
Often feel uncomfortable around others.
Avoid contacts with others.
Am not really interested in others.
Keep others at a distance.

The items which have been marked +keyed are scored positively. It means if they have been marked ‘strongly agree’, they are scored 4, and if they have been ‘strongly disagree’, they are scored 0. For those items marked –keyed, if the respondents select ‘strongly agree’, they are scored 0, whilst, if they check ‘strongly disagree’, they are scored 4. The alpha ratio (listed in parentheses) shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.
B. Gregariousness (Alpha=.79)

Gregariousness is a facet of Extraversion. Gregarious people find the company of others pleasantly stimulating and rewarding. They enjoy the excitement of crowds. They seek and enjoy the company of others and they are sociable. They tend to move in or form a group with others of the same kind. They have the quality of being gregarious. Gregarious people have a dislike of being alone. Low scorers tend to feel overwhelmed by, and therefore actively avoid, large crowds. They do not necessarily dislike being with people sometimes, but their need for privacy and time to themselves is much greater than for individuals who score high on this scale.

Some of the items which test the Gregariousness facet are as follows:

+ keyed
  Love large parties.
  Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
  Enjoy being part of a group.
  Involve others in what I am doing.
  Love surprise parties.

– keyed
  Prefer to be alone.
  Want to be left alone.
  Don't like crowded events.
  Avoid crowds.
  Seek quiet.

The alpha ratio (listed in parentheses) shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

C. Assertiveness (Alpha=.84)

Assertiveness is another facet of Extraversion. High scorers Assertiveness like to speak out, take charge, and direct the activities of others. They tend to be leaders in groups. Low scorers tend not to talk much and let others control the activities of groups. It is a particular mode of communication. Dorland's Medical Dictionary defines Assertiveness as: a form of behavior characterized by a confident declaration.
or affirmation of a statement without need of proof; this affirms the person's rights or point of view without either aggressively threatening the rights of another (assuming a position of dominance) or submissively permitting another to ignore or deny one's rights or point of view.

Aggressive people do not respect the personal boundaries of others and thus are liable to harm others while trying to influence them. A person communicates assertively by overcoming fear of speaking his or her mind or trying to influence others, but doing so in a way that respects the personal boundaries of others. Assertive people are also willing to defend themselves against aggressive people.

Some of the items which test the Assertiveness are as follows:

+ keyed  
Take charge.  
Try to lead others.  
Can talk others into doing things.  
Seek to influence others.  
Take control of things.

– keyed  
Wait for others to lead the way.  
Keep in the background.  
Have little to say.  
Don't like to draw attention to myself.  
Hold back my opinions.

The alpha ratio (listed in parentheses) shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

**D. Activity (Alpha=.71)**

The fourth facet of Extraversion is Activity which is also called Energetic. Active individuals lead fast-paced, busy lives. They move about quickly, energetically, and vigorously, and they are involved in many activities. People who score low on this scale follow a slower and more leisurely, relaxed pace.

Some of the items which test the Activity are as follows:
Am always busy.
Am always on the go.
Do a lot in my spare time.
Can manage many things at the same time.
React quickly.

Like to take it easy.
Like to take my time.
Like a leisurely lifestyle.
Let things proceed at their own pace.
React slowly.

The alpha ratio (listed in parentheses=.71) shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

**E. Excitement Seeking (Alpha=.78)**

The next facet of Extraversion is Excitement seeking or Adventurous. High scorers on this scale are easily bored without high levels of stimulation. They love bright lights and hustle and bustle. They are likely to take risks and seek thrills. Low scorers are overwhelmed by noise and commotion and are adverse to thrill-seeking.

Some of the items which test the excitement seeking are as follows

+ keyed Love excitement.

Seek adventure.

Love action.

Enjoy being part of a loud crowd.

Enjoy being reckless.

Act wild and crazy.

Am willing to try anything once.

Seek danger.
Would never go hang gliding or bungee jumping.
Dislike loud music.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.78, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

F. Positive Emotions (Alpha=.81)

The last facet of Extraversion is Positive emotions. This scale measures positive mood and Feelings, not negative emotions (which are a part of the Neuroticism domain). This facet also measures a person's ability to experience a range of positive Feelings, including happiness, enthusiasm, optimism and joy. Persons who score high on this scale typically experience a range of positive Feelings, including happiness, enthusiasm, optimism, and joy. Low scorers are not as prone to such energetic, high spirits.

Some of the items which test the positive emotions are as follows:

+ keyed Radiate joy.
  Have a lot of fun.
  Express childlike joy.
  Laugh my way through life.
  Love life.
  Look at the bright side of life.
  Laugh aloud.
  Amuse my friends.
– keyed Am not easily amused.
  Seldom joke around.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.81, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

2. Facets of Agreeableness vs. Antagonism

Agreeableness consists of six facets including Trust, Morality, Altruism, Cooperation, Modesty, and Sympathy.
A. Trust (Alpha=.82)

The first facet of Agreeableness is Trust. These traits from the Adjective check list (listed in parentheses following each facet) correlated substantially with scores on the facet in a study of self-ratings (Costa and McCrae, 1992, p.49). Forgiving people are inclined or able to forgive and show mercy; "a kindly forgiving nature"; "a forgiving embrace to the naughty child". They take people at face value and they are willing to forgive and forget. A person with high Trust assumes that most people are fair, honest, and have good intentions. Persons low in Trust may see others as selfish, devious, and potentially dangerous.

Some of the items which test the Trust are as follows:

+ keyed

Trust others.
Believe that others have good intentions.
Trust what people say.
Believe that people are basically moral.
Believe in human goodness.
Think that all will be well.

– keyed

DisTrust people.
Suspect hidden motives in others.
Am wary of others.
Believe that people are essentially evil.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.82, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

B. Straightforwardness (Alpha=.75)

Straightforwardness is another facet of Agreeableness. It is the quality of being direct and straightforward; what some people take for rudeness is really straightforwardness High scorers on this scale see no need for pretence or manipulation when dealing with others and are therefore candid, frank, and sincere. Low scorers believe that a certain amount of deception in Social relationships is necessary. People find it relatively easy to relate to the straightforward high-scorers
on this scale. They generally find it more difficult to relate to the low-scorers on this scale. It should be made clear that low scorers are not unprincipled or immoral; they are simply more guarded and less willing to openly reveal the whole truth.

Some of the items which test the Straightforwardness are as follows:

+ keyed  Would never cheat on my taxes.
   Stick to the rules.

– keyed  Use flattery to get ahead.
   Use others for my own ends.
   Know how to get around the rules.
   Cheat to get ahead.
   Put people under pressure.
   Pretend to be concerned for others.
   Take advantage of others.
   Obstruct others' plans.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.75, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

C. *Altruism (Alpha= .77)*

The next facet of Agreeableness is Altruism. Altruistic people find helping other people genuinely rewarding. Consequently, they are generally willing to assist those who are in need. Altruistic people find that doing things for others is a form of self-fulfillment rather than self-sacrifice. Low scorers on this scale do not particularly like helping those in need.

Some of the items which test the Altruism are as follows:

+ keyed  Make people feel welcome.
   Anticipate the needs of others.
   Love to help others.
   Am concerned about others.
   Have a good word for everyone.
Look down on others.
Am indifferent to the Feelings of others.
Make people feel uncomfortable.
Turn my back on others.
Take no time for others.

The alpha ratio (listed in parentheses=.77) shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

D. Compliance (Alpha=.73)

Compliance refers to a response — specifically, a submission — made in reaction to a request. Based on the classification of McCrae and Costa (2003), this is a facet of agreeableness trait. Those who score high in this test tend to be respectful, hiding their Angry Hostility, and being pardoner. And those who score a low mark tend to be competitive and show their Angry Hostility. Studying Compliance is significant because it is a type of Social influence that affects our everyday behavior—especially Social interactions. The use of persuasion to achieve Compliance has numerous applications in interpersonal interactions. Compliance strategies exploit psychological processes in Order to prompt a desired outcome. Individuals who score high on this scale dislike confrontations. They are perfectly willing to compromise or to deny their own needs in Order to get along with others. Those who score low on this scale are more likely to intimidate others to get their way.

Some of the items which test the Compliance are as follows:

+ keyed
  Am easy to satisfy.
  Can't stand confrontations.
  Hate to seem pushy.

– keyed
  Have a sharp tongue.
  Contradict others.
  Love a good fight.
  Yell at people.
Insult people.
Get back at others.
Hold a grudge.

The alpha ratio (listed in parentheses=.73) shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

E. **Modesty** *(Alpha=.77)*

Modesty is another facet of agreeableness which can be defined as freedom from exaggeration, self-control, or having a moderate opinion of oneself. Mullins (1992) claims that Modesty involves an accurate assessment of one's worth combined with sensitivity to the Feelings of others that prevents one from talking about it too much. A fundamental characteristic of Modesty is the fact that it is not simply a self-regarding attitude, but is instead a profoundly other-regarding stance.

Those who score a high mark in this facet tend to be humble and ignorant to themselves. However, they do not have a low self-confidence or self-esteem and those who are on the other extreme tend to think they are exceptional and normally they are considered proud and selfish by others. High scorers on this scale do not like to claim that they are better than other people. In some cases this attitude may derive from low self-confidence or self-esteem. Nonetheless, some people with high self-esteem find it unseemly. Those who are willing to describe themselves as superior tend to be seen as disagreeably arrogant by other people. High scorers are unassuming, rather self-effacing and humble. However it is important to understand that they are not necessarily lacking in self-confidence or self-esteem.

Some of the items which test the Modesty are as follows:

+ keyed  Dislike being the center of attention.
Dislike talking about myself.
Consider myself an average person.
Seldom toot my own horn.

– keyed  Believe that I am better than others.
Think highly of myself.
Have a high opinion of myself.
Know the answers to many questions.
Boast about my virtues.
Make myself the center of attention.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.77, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

F. Tender-Mindedness (Alpha=.75)

Tender-mindedness is another facet of agreeableness personality trait. People who score high on this scale are tender-hearted and compassionate. They feel the pain of others vicariously and are easily moved to pity. Low scorers are not affected strongly by human suffering. They pride themselves on making objective judgments based on reason. They are more concerned with truth and impartial justice than with mercy.

Some of the items which test the Tender-mindedness are as follows:

+ keyed
  Sympathize with the homeless.
  Feel sympathy for those who are worse off than myself.
  Value cooperation over competition.
  Suffer from others' sorrows.

– keyed
  Am not interested in other people's problems.
  Tend to dislike soft-hearted people.
  Believe in an eye for an eye.
  Try not to think about the needy.
  Believe people should fend for themselves.
  Can't stand weak people.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.75, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.
3. Facets of Conscientiousness vs. Lack of Direction

Conscientiousness contains six facets of Self-Efficacy, Orderliness, Dutifulness, Achievement-Striving, Self-Discipline, and Cautiousness.

A. Competence (Alpha=.78)

Competence is the first facet of Conscientiousness personality trait. Competency or Self-Efficacy describes an individual's confidence in their ability to accomplish things. High scorers believe they have the intelligence (common sense), drive, and self-control necessary for achieving success. Low scorers do not feel effective, and may have a sense that they are not in control of their lives.

Some of the items which test the Competence are as follows:

+ keyed
  Complete tasks successfully.
  Excel in what I do.
  Handle tasks smoothly.
  Am sure of my ground.
  Come up with good solutions.
  Know how to get things done.

– keyed
  Misjudge situations.
  Don't understand things.
  Have little to contribute.
  Don't see the consequences of things.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.78, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

B. Order (Alpha=.82)

Orderliness is another facet of Conscientiousness. People with high scores in this area are well-organized, tidy and neat. They like to live according to routines and schedules. They keep lists and make plans. Low scorers tend to be disorganized and scattered.
Some of the items which test the Orderliness are as follows:

+ keyed  Like Order.
    Like to tidy up.
    Want everything to be "just right."
    Love Order and regularity.
    Do things according to a plan.
– keyed  Often forget to put things back in their proper place.
    Leave a mess in my room.
    Leave my belongings around.
    Am not bothered by messy people.
    Am not bothered by disOrder.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.82, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

C. **Dutifulness (Alpha=.71)**

This facet of Conscientiousness personality reflects the strength of a person's sense of duty and obligation. Those who score high on this scale have a strong sense of moral obligation and they are careful to fulfill obligations. Low scorers find contracts, rules, and regulations overly confining. They are likely to be seen as unreliable or even irresponsible.

Some of the items which test the Dutifulness are as follows:

+ keyed  Try to follow the rules.
    Keep my promises.
    Pay my bills on time.
    Tell the truth.
    Listen to my conscience.
– keyed  Break rules.
    Break my promises.
    Get others to do my duties.
Do the opposite of what is asked.
Misrepresent the facts.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.71, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

D. Achievement-Striving (Alpha= .78)

Achievement-Striving is another facet of Conscientiousness personality trait. Individuals who score high on this scale strive hard to achieve excellence. Their drive to be recognized as successful keeps them on track toward their lofty goals. They often have a strong sense of direction in life, but extremely high scores may be too single-minded and obsessed with their work. Low scorers are content to get by with a minimal amount of work, and might be seen by others as lazy.

Some of the items which test the Achievement-Strivings are as follows:

+ keyed
  
  Go straight for the goal.
  Work hard.
  Turn plans into actions.
  Plunge into tasks with all my heart.
  Do more than what's expected of me.
  Set high standards for myself and others.
  Demand quality.

– keyed
  
  Am not highly motivated to succeed.
  Do just enough work to get by.
  Put little time and effort into my work.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.78, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

E. Self-Discipline (Alpha= .85)

Self-Discipline, what many people call will-power, refers to the ability to persist at difficult or unpleasant tasks until they are completed. People who possess
high Self-Discipline are able to overcome reluctance to begin tasks and stay on track despite distractions. Those with low Self-Discipline procrastinate and show poor follow-through, often failing to complete tasks—even tasks they want very much to complete.

It is the training and control of oneself and one's conduct, usually for personal improvement. Self-Discipline is the companion of willpower. It is synonymous with self-control, which is the ability to avoid unreasonable excess of anything that could lead to negative consequences.

Self-Discipline appears in various forms, such as endurance, perseverance and restraint, and as the ability to carry out one's decisions and plans, in spite of inconvenience, hardships or obstacles. One of the main characteristics of Self-Discipline is the ability to forgo instinctive and immediate gratification or pleasure, in favor of some greater gain or more satisfying results, even if this requires effort and time. High scorers in this scale tend to get chores done right away. They are always prepared and they carry out their plans. Low scorers waste time and need a push to get started.

Some of the items which test the Self-Discipline are as follows:

+ keyed
  Get chores done right away.
  Am always prepared.
  Start tasks right away.
  Get to work at once.
  Carry out my plans.

– keyed
  Find it difficult to get down to work.
  Waste my time.
  Need a push to get started.
  Have difficulty starting tasks.
  Postpone decisions.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.85, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.
F. Deliberation (Alpha=.76)

Deliberation is another facet of Conscientiousness personality trait. It is the act of deliberating, or of weighing and examining the reasons for and against a choice or measure; careful consideration; mature reflection. Deliberation or Cautiousness describes the disposition to think through possibilities before acting. High scorers on the Cautiousness scale take their time when making decisions. Low scorers often say or do the first thing that comes to mind without deliberating alternatives and the probable consequences of those alternatives.

Some of the items which test the Deliberation are as follows:

+ keyed  Avoid mistakes.
Choose my words with care.
Stick to my chosen path.
– keyed  Jump into things without thinking.
Make rash decisions.
Like to act on a whim.
Rush into things.
Do crazy things.
Act without thinking.
Often make last-minute plans.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.76, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

4. Facets of Neuroticism vs. Emotional Stability

Neuroticism consists of six facets of Angry, Anger, Depression, Self-Consciousness, Immoderation, and Vulnerability.
A. Anxiety (Alpha = .83)

Anxiety is the first facet of Neuroticism. Anxiety, also called angry or worry, is a psychological and physiological state characterized by somatic, emotional, Cognitive, and behavioral components. It is the displeasing feeling of fear and concern. The root meaning of the word Angry is 'to vex or trouble'; in either presence or absence of psychological stress, Angry can create Feelings of fear, worry, uneasiness, and dread. Angry is considered to be a normal reaction to a stressor. It may help an individual to deal with a demanding situation by prompting them to cope with it. When Angry becomes excessive, it may fall under the classification of an Angry disOrder. The 'fight-or-flight' system of the brain of anxious individuals is too easily and too often engaged. Therefore, people who score high in this area often feel like something unpleasant, threatening or dangerous is about to happen. They may be afraid of specific situations or be just generally fearful. They feel tense, jittery, and nervous. Persons low-in- Angry are generally calm and fearless.

Some of the items which test the Angry are as follows:

+ keyed  Worry about things.
  Fear for the worst.
  Am afraid of many things.
  Get stressed out easily.
  Get caught up in my problems.

– keyed Am not easily bothered by things.
  Am relaxed most of the time.
  Am not easily disturbed by events.
  Don't worry about things that have already happened.
  Adapt easily to new situations.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.83, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.
B. **Angry Hostility (Alpha= .88)**

Angry Hostility is another facet of Neuroticism personality trait. Persons who score high in Anger feel enraged when things do not go their way. They are sensitive about being treated fairly and feel resentful and bitter when they feel they are being cheated. This scale measures the tendency to feel angry; whether or not the person expresses annoyance and hostility depends on the individual's level on Agreeableness. Low scorers do not get angry often or easily. This facet measures the tendency to feel angry. Whether or not a person expresses annoyance and hostility depends on his or her level of Agreeableness.

Some of the items which test the Angry Hostility are as follows:

+ keyed
  - Get angry easily.
  - Get irritated easily.
  - Get upset easily.
  - Am often in a bad mood.
  - Lose my temper.

– keyed
  - Rarely get irritated.
  - Seldom get mad.
  - Am not easily annoyed.
  - Keep my cool.
  - Rarely complain.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.88, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

C. **Depression (Alpha= .88)**

This scale measures the tendency to feel sad, dejected, and discouraged. High scorers lack energy and have difficult initiating activities. Low scorers tend to be free from these depressive Feelings. This facet measures normal differences in the way that people react to life's ups and downs. We are not using the word 'Depression' in a medical or clinical sense.
Some of the items which test the Depression are as follows:

+ keyed
  - Often feel blue.
  - Dislike myself.
  - Am often down in the dumps.
  - Have a low opinion of myself.
  - Have frequent mood swings.
  - Feel desperate.
  - Feel that my life lacks direction.

– keyed
  - Seldom feel blue.
  - Feel comfortable with myself.
  - Am very pleased with myself.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.88, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

D. Self-Consciousness (Alpha=.80)

Self-conscious individuals are sensitive about what others think of them. Their concern about rejection and ridicule cause them to feel shy and uncomfortable around others. They are easily embarrassed and often feel ashamed. Their fears that others will criticize or make fun of them are exaggerated and unrealistic, but their awkwardness and discomfort may make these fears a self-fulfilling prophecy. Low scorers, in contrast, do not suffer from the mistaken impression that everyone is watching and judging them. They do not feel nervous in Social situations.

Some of the items which test the Self-Consciousness are as follows:

+ keyed
  - Am easily intimidated.
  - Am afraid that I will do the wrong thing.
  - Find it difficult to approach others.
  - Am afraid to draw attention to myself.
  - Only feel comfortable with friends.
  - Stumble over my words.
Am not embarrassed easily.
Am comfortable in unfamiliar situations.
Am not bothered by difficult Social situations.
Am able to stand up for myself.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.80, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

E. Impulsiveness (Alpha=.77)

Impulsiveness is a facet of Neuroticism personality trait which is also called Immoderation. Immoderate individuals feel strong cravings and urges that they have difficulty resisting. They tend to be oriented toward short-term pleasures and rewards rather than long-term consequences.

People who score in the high range for Immoderation feel strong cravings and urges that they have difficulty resisting, even though they know that they are likely to regret it later. They tend to be oriented toward short-term pleasures and rewards rather than long-term consequences. Low scorers do not experience strong, irresistible cravings and consequently do not find themselves tempted to overindulge.

Some of the items which test the Impulsiveness are as follows:

+ keyed
  Often eat too much.
  Don't know why I do some of the things I do.
  Do things I later regret.
  Go on binges.
  Love to eat.

– keyed
  Rarely overindulge.
  Easily resist temptations.
  Am able to control my cravings.
  Never spend more than I can afford.
  Never splurge.
The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.77, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

F. **Vulnerability (Alpha= .82)**

High scorers on Vulnerability experience panic, confusion, and helplessness when under pressure or stress. Low scorers feel more poised, confident, and clear-thinking when stressed.

High scorers on Sensitivity to Stress have difficulty in coping with stress. They experience panic, confusion and helplessness when under pressure or when facing emergency situations.

Some of the items which test the Impulsiveness are as follows

+ keyed  Panic easily.
   Become overwhelmed by events.
   Feel that I'm unable to deal with things.
   Can't make up my mind.
   Get overwhelmed by emotions.

– keyed  Remain calm under pressure.
   Can handle complex problems.
   Know how to cope.
   Readily overcome setbacks.
   Am calm even in tense situations.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.82, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

5. **Facets of Openness vs. Closeness to Experience**

Openness Personality trait includes six facets of Imagination, Artistic Interests, Emotionality, Adventurousness, Intellect, and Liberalism.
A. Ideas (Alpha=.86)

Intellect and artistic interests are the two most important, central aspects of Openness to experience personality trait. High scorers on Intellect love to play with ideas. They are open-minded to new and unusual ideas, and like to debate intellectual issues. They enjoy riddles, puzzles, and brain teasers. Low scorers on Intellect prefer dealing with people or things rather than ideas. They regard intellectual exercises as a waste of time. Intellect should not be equated with intelligence. Intellect is an intellectual style, not an intellectual ability, although high scorers on Intellect score slightly higher than low-intellect individuals on standardized intelligence tests.

Intellect and artistic interests are the two most important, central aspects of Openness to Experience.

Some of the items which test the Ideas are as follows:

+ keyed
  Like to solve complex problems.
  Love to read challenging material.
  Have a rich vocabulary.
  Can handle a lot of information.
  Enjoy thinking about things.

– keyed
  Am not interested in abstract ideas.
  Avoid philosophical discussions.
  Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.
  Am not interested in theoretical discussions.
  Avoid difficult reading material.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.86, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

B. Fantasy (Alpha=.83)

Fantasy is the second facet of Openness personality trait. This facet is also called imagination. To imaginative individuals, the real world is often too plain and ordinary. High scorers on this scale use fantasy as a way of creating a richer, more
interesting world. Low scorers are on this scale are more oriented to facts than fantasy. To imaginative individuals the real world is often too plain and ordinary. High scorers for this facet use fantasy, not as an escape, but as a way of creating for themselves, a richer and more interesting inner-world.

Some of the items which test the Ideas are as follows:

+ keyed Have a vivid imagination.
   Enjoy wild flights of fantasy.
   Love to daydream.
   Like to get lost in thought.
   Indulge in my fantasies.
   Spend time reflecting on things.

– keyed Seldom daydream.
   Do not have a good imagination.
   Seldom get lost in thought.
   Have difficulty imagining things.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.83, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

   C. Aesthetics (Alpha=.84)

   High scorers on this scale love beauty, both in art and in nature. They become easily involved and absorbed in artistic and natural events. They are not necessarily artistically trained or talented, although many will be. The defining features of this scale are interest in, and appreciation of natural and artificial beauty. Low scorers lack aesthetic sensitivity and interest in the arts.

Some of the items which test the Artistic interests are as follows:

   + keyed Believe in the importance of art.
      Like music
      See beauty in things that others might not notice.
      Love flowers.
Enjoy the beauty of nature

- keyed
  
  Do not like art.
  
  Do not like poetry.
  
  Do not enjoy going to art museums.
  
  Do not like concerts.
  
  Do not enjoy watching dance performances.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.84, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

D. Actions (Alpha=.77)

Actions are another facet of Openness personality trait. These traits from the Adjective check list (listed in parentheses following this facet) correlated substantially with scores on the facet in a study of self-ratings (Costa and McCrae, 1992).

High scorers on adventurousness are eager to try new activities, travel to foreign lands, and experience different things. They find familiarity and routine boring, and will take a new route home just because it is different. Low scorers tend to feel uncomfortable with change and prefer familiar routines. Low scorers dislike changes and try not to risk their life through experimenting new things.

Some of the items which test the Actions facet are as follows:

+ keyed
  
  Prefer variety to routine.
  
  Like to visit new places.
  
  Am interested in many things.
  
  Like to begin new things.

– keyed
  
  Prefer to stick with things that I know.
  
  Dislike changes.
  
  Don't like the idea of change.
  
  Am a creature of habit.
  
  Dislike new foods.
  
  Am attached to conventional ways.
The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.77, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

E. Feelings (Alpha= .81)

Openness to Feelings is another facet of Openness personality trait. Emotional people tend to experience their emotions tensely and feel the emotion of others.

Persons high on Emotionality have good access to and awareness of their own Feelings. Low scorers are less aware of their Feelings and tend not to express their emotions openly.

Some of the items which test the Actions facet are as follows:

+ keyed
  Experience my emotions intensely.
  Feel others' emotions.
  Am passionate about causes.
  Enjoy examining myself and my life.
  Try to understand myself.

– keyed
  Seldom get emotional.
  Am not easily affected by my emotions.
  Rarely notice my emotional reactions.
  Experience very few emotional highs and lows.
  Don't understand people who get emotional.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.81, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

F. Values (Alpha=.86)

Openness to Values is another scale included in Openness personality traits. Values contain Liberalism and conventionalism. 'Psychological liberalism' refers to a readiness to challenge authority, convention and traditional Values. In its most extreme form, psychological liberalism can even represent outright hostility toward rules, sympathy for law-breakers, and love of ambiguity, chaos, and disOrder.
Psychological conservatives prefer the security and stability brought by conformity to tradition. Psychological liberalism and conservatism are not identical to political affiliation, but certainly incline individuals toward certain political parties.

Some of the items which test the Values facet are as follows:

**+ keyed**
- Tend to vote for liberal political candidates.
- Believe that there is no absolute right and wrong.
- Believe that criminals should receive help rather than punishment.

**– keyed**
- Believe in one true religion.
- Tend to vote for conservative political candidates.
- Believe that too much tax money goes to support artists.
- Believe laws should be strictly enforced.
- Believe that we coddle criminals too much.
- Believe that we should be tough on crime.
- Like to stand during the national anthem.

The alpha ratio, listed in parentheses=.86, shows the reliability of this facet which is an acceptable reliability.

**1.10 Importance and Statement of the Topic**

In the last several decades there has been a tremendous wave of interest in the western society around two very important aspects of language learning. According to Brown (2000), the first aspect is the relationship between personality type and success in EFL/ESL learning. The second aspect which has shifted the attention of most researchers from Teaching Methodology and Teacher-centered Approach to Learner-centered approach is the study of strategies or specific methods of approaching a problem or task and the effects of these strategies on language learning proficiency.

A lot of research has been conducted to investigate the role of personality factors in learning a new language (See Gardener and Lambert, 1972). The role of Learning strategies and their impact on language learning are other topics which have been studied during the last two decades. Research has shown that some factors exert influence on the strategies that the language learners select and use. For example,
gender is one factor that has been explored by many researchers. In many EFL strategy frequency studies involving gender, the results have usually favored females as more frequent users of strategies (for instance, Green, 1992; Noguchi, 1991; Oxford, 1993; Green and Oxford, 1993). Among the other factors that affect the use of strategy and have been researched are cultural background (See Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995), learning styles (See Sheorey, 1998; Oxford et. al, 1991), and learners' self-efficacy beliefs (See Yang, N. 1999). The above mentioned factors have been proposed as mediators of the use of language strategy. Hence little has been done on the relationship between big five Personality Factors (See Costa, and McCrae1992) and the Use of Learning Strategies (See Oxford, 1990).

The present study aims at exploring the relationship between personality traits and the type of strategies one uses in learning a foreign or second language. An awareness of these factors may help teachers reconsider their teaching methods and come up with more effective approaches in teaching foreign languages. Since not all students are alike, their personality attributes are quite different. Teachers need to recognize and understand a multiplicity of individual learning processes and to make appropriate judgments about each student when the teachers meet the students’ needs and they want to provide them with optimal opportunities for learning.

1.1.1 Limitations of the Study

When a researcher studies a topic or a sample group, there are some uncontrollable factors which might affect the quality of the research. Although this research was carefully prepared, the researcher is still aware of its limitations and shortcomings. There are two noteworthy limitations that need to be addressed regarding the present study.

First of all, the research was conducted in beginning level English classes which had just started learning English for 4 months. They were not proficient enough to read and fully comprehend the items in questionnaires, however, it was tried to eliminate the comprehension through proctors by explaining ambiguities and misunderstandings raised by examinees, some of the testees did not bother to ask the ones in vigilant. So, the researcher is doubtful that subjects left some items
unanswered or random selected some items which indirectly affects the reliability of the results.

The second limitation has to do with the extent to which the findings can be generalized beyond the cases studied. The cases studied in this research as EFL Iranians are not that foreign to English as there are limited chances of communications in English with their few non-Iranian classmates. On the other hand, Indian ESL learners are in some cases only in contact with their Indian fellows spending more than 90 per cent of their communication time with their mother tongue which is Marathi in this study. Therefore, both these problems may affect the concept of considering Indians as ESL learners and Iranians studying in India as EFL learners.