



<https://doi.org/10.5559/di.28.4.07>

THE ROLE OF PERSONALITY TRAITS IN THE CHOICE AND USE OF LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES

Jelisaveta ŠAFRANJ
Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad

Aleksandra GOJKOV-RAJIĆ
Teacher Training Faculty, Belgrade

UDK: 378.042:81'43

159.92:81'43

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Primljeno: 10. 3. 2018.

The paper aims to investigate the relationships between foreign language learning strategies (FLLS) and personality traits among students of education and engineering sciences. Quantitative survey of self-report questionnaire was used to evaluate learning strategies and individual personality traits. Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated and six linear regressions were conducted to test the predictive role of personality dimensions when language learning strategies were used as a criterion. The findings propose that students with different personality traits have different preferences when it comes to learning strategies. Two out of five personality traits from this study seem to have an important role in the prediction of the FLLS type used. While low *Conscientiousness* was predictive of more frequent usage of Cognitive and Compensation strategies, high *Intellect* was predictive of more frequent usage of Cognitive and Metacognitive strategies. The study points out the significance of managing students by meeting their personal differences in choosing learning strategies, and not by relying on the personality stereotypes that are predominant. The obtained results can help teachers to select appropriate learning strategies that match students' different personality types.

Keywords: language learning strategies, SILL, personality traits, Big Five Model, university students



Jelisaveta Šafranj, University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Sciences, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 6, 21 101 Novi Sad, Serbia.
E-mail: savetas@uns.ac.rs

INTRODUCTION

Oxford (1990) and Cohen (1998) explain language learning strategies as conscious operations the student uses in foreign language learning to enhance the acquisition, storage, memory, and use of stored information. It is pointed out that learning strategies are operations that the student chooses consciously and that this element of choice is what gives the strategies significance in the process of foreign language learning. Likewise, it can be said that students use strategies to facilitate learning, make it faster, more self-guided, more effective and convenient to new language tasks (Cohen, 1998). In addition, learning strategies influence self-empowerment, which is an important feature for adults who learn a foreign language because they are unlikely to be in a position to constantly meet a teacher who would teach them and direct them when they are out of classroom. Moreover, self-directedness and learning independence are extremely important traits that need to be improved if we want the learning of foreign language to be successful and effective in various language situations. So, when students, in whole or in part, take responsibility for their own learning, it becomes productive, and then both teachers and students have more satisfaction in teaching and learning. There is also the pleasure of self-confidence and conviction of making the right choice and taking the right direction towards success.

The assumption is that language learning strategies, in terms of complex cognitive skills, can be traced to indicate how important their role is in improving the overall ability of language learning. The main characteristics of the strategies according to Oxford (1990) are that they reflect the conscious effort that a student makes in learning foreign language and allow the learner to take control of the process of adopting foreign language. In addition, learning strategies affect the success of the process of adopting foreign language, they are the source of individual differences among students, and finally, learning strategies are the characteristics of individuals and are considered to be highly susceptible to change. Strategies can be learnt and exercised until they become automated, when the student becomes quick and skilled in their use (Oxford, 1990).

In the last several decades researchers have proved that students' individual differences are significant in the quality of their foreign language learning (Ehrman, 1990, 2008; Galbraith & Gardner, 1988; Leaver, Ehrman, & Shekhtman, 2005; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Oxford, 1992; Sharp, 2008; Skehan, 1989; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). Relying on the results of investigated differences, Oxford (1990) proposed language learning styles and strategies. In addition, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) de-

scribed learning strategies as particular thoughts or behaviours used to facilitate students' understanding, learning, or maintaining new information. They are considered to be one of the most important variables influencing foreign language achievement and performance (Mijušković & Simović, 2016). Therefore, language teachers should offer students certain information to develop their consciousness about the choice of their own learning strategies and consequently improve their learning abilities (Carlo, 2016).

In the teaching process, the strategies are very important because they are means for active, self-directed action, which is necessary for the development of communicative competence (Oxford, 1990). Since the development and growth of communicative competence is one of the most important objectives of foreign language teaching, it can be said that all appropriate language learning strategies are directed towards this broadly set goal. As students' competence grows, strategies can, in certain ways, nurture some aspects of proficiency, and can function at both the general and specific level, i.e. can deal with systemic language issues, but also with individual areas, such as grammar or vocabulary, reading skills or oral expression. Appropriate foreign language learning strategies result in enhanced linguistic knowledge and increased student confidence, which is of paramount importance for long-term success in the process of foreign language learning.

Oxford's (1990) *Strategy Inventory for Language Learning* (SILL) has been criticised on several counts, for example on weaknesses of any survey-based research which indicates inaccurate interpretation of questions and possible misunderstandings. In addition, the criticism pointed out some difficulties involved in validating the extent to which the responses are truthful (Dornyei, 2007; McKai, 2006). Further criticism considers the fact that the SILL only supplies with the quantitative data. Since students' behaviour can differ from one context to the other they may be in doubt about which option to indicate when reading the statements such as "I look for patterns in the new language" or "I ask other people to correct my pronunciation" (Ellis, 2004).

Another problem is that the students have to recognise that they have an affective problem in order to answer affirmatively to any of the affective strategy items. Good learners rarely have emotional or psychological problems that less successful individuals encounter, so when they come upon the affective items, they rank their use very low because they do not often seem to need them. When good learners feel anxious they tend to use all the other strategy types more effectively, not necessarily more frequently, except for the affective ones.

In order to overcome some limitations of the SILL questionnaire such as ignoring individual, situational and cultural dimensions of strategy use, as well as neglecting the dynamic nature of LLS, some critics propose to contextualise and complement it with alternative data collection tools. A task-based survey closely related to a previously completed activity may be created in order to contextualise the nature of strategic learning (Fan, 2003). Another possibility may be designing questionnaires that provide both qualitative and quantitative data, which will ensure that students are provided with the opportunity to give more detailed information on specific issues.

These problems encouraged researchers to look for other ways of assessing strategy use, opting in many cases for domain-specific instruments. Although Oxford (1990) pointed out some shortcomings, the SILL will most likely remain one of the most popular data collection tools in the foreseeable future.

Personality Type and Language Learning Strategies

The relationship between personality type and the individual's preference of learning strategies was investigated by Ehrman and Oxford (1990). The overall personality types of language learners, teachers, and supervisors were studied. The results revealed that affective and visualisation strategies were used by extraverts more than introverts, and that introverts applied strategies for communication and investigation more frequently than extraverts. In addition, it is proved that intuitive people applied more strategies for communication and investigation using language for authentic communication, assembling mental models of the language, and managing emotions compared with sensing-type people (Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). Additional findings suggest that judging-type people used general study strategies more often in comparison with perceiving-type people, but these individuals used strategies for communication and investigation more frequently than judging-type individuals.

Mumford and Gustafson (1988) suggested an alternative insight when dealing with the relationship between cognitive processes, personality traits, and foreign language performance. First, personality traits may initiate the motivational hindrance or desire to use or not to use language learning strategies and thus inhibit or improve students' language activity. Second, the effective use of strategies can be facilitated or inhibited by personality traits and thus deteriorate or improve language activity. Third, depending on the personality traits when there are initial shortcomings and failures in language activity, a person may try again or abandon the language activity.

Students with high levels of neuroticism feel more comfortable in highly structured learning settings, which help them avoid anxiety and the distress caused by time pressures (Furnham, 1992). Extroverts prefer more pragmatic learning concepts and are inclined to learning approaches which support critical thinking (Zhang, 2003). Students with a high level of conscientiousness prefer approaches involving more organisation and time management, while students who are open to new experiences tend to feel more comfortable seeking help or participating in peer learning in their academic activities.

There is considerable evidence about links between personality traits and learning strategies, but the joint outcome of these two variables on students' performance is still insufficiently examined. Therefore, there is a need to combine the effects of all of these variables to predict how they affect students' academic achievement (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2008; Rotgans & Schmidt, 2010; Zhang, 2003). There is a widely accepted opinion that learning strategies can be controlled and changed through teaching methodology, and therefore, that it is important to assess the effectiveness of learning strategies for students with different personality traits. Aiming to assist language teachers and provide them with additional insight into meeting the students' language learning needs, this study examines the relationships between personality type, and foreign language learning strategies (FLLS) of students in Serbia. A number of researchers have investigated the role of personality in learning foreign language in Western countries (Ehrman, 1990; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990, 1995; Carrell & Monroe, 1993). However, few researchers have examined differences among personality type and FLLS across different cultures. Therefore, it is unknown whether or not findings about foreign language learning in Western societies can be generalised to students in Serbia.

A small number of researchers dealt with the relationships between the strategies measured by the SILL questionnaire and personality traits according to the Big Five Model. Furthermore, most research dealing with this topic points out features such as *Openness to experience* and *Conscientiousness* and fewer authors investigate the effects of all five personality types on the degree of use of these strategies. In addition, in the research, Myers-Briggs Type Indicators (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998) are more commonly used, with an emphasis on examining differences in the application of these strategies between personality types (Chen & Hung, 2012; Kayaoglu, 2013). Finally, with the exception of Fazeli (2011a, 2011b, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2012e) regression analysis has not been used in this kind of research so far. The idea of allowing insight into the predictive contribution of per-

sonality traits in the context of learning strategies remained disregarded, while the principal results of current studies are based only on simple correlations (Blickle, 1996; Fazeli, 2011b; Kato, 2009; Molaei, 2013; Obralic & Mulalic, 2017). The results reported by Fazeli (2011a, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2012d, 2012e) suggest that only personality traits *Conscientiousness* and *Openness to experience (Intellect)* are significant predictors of metacognitive, compensation, social, affective and memory strategies. In addition, he showed that *Neuroticism* is correlated negatively with the use of Cognitive, Memory, Social and Metacognitive strategies. However, taking into account an overall picture of the relationship between personality dimensions on one side, and usage of six types of FLLS on the other, it can be concluded that the results of previous research are inconsistent.

From the above, it can be noted that this study has a significant contribution in at least two aspects: taking into account all the personality traits according to the Big Five Model and their predictive role in the context of six learning strategies according to the SILL questionnaire, within one single research, while more appropriate statistical methods were used to answer this question, as opposed to most previous studies.

Based on the aforementioned results, several hypotheses were formulated and further tested in this study:

- H1: Extraversion is a positive predictor of usage of all six types of language learning strategies measured by SILL.
- H2: Agreeableness is a positive predictor of usage of Affective strategies.
- H3: Intellect is a positive predictor of usage of all six types of language learning strategies measured by SILL.
- H4: Conscientiousness is a positive predictor of usage of all six types of language learning strategies measured by SILL.
- H5: Emotional stability is a positive predictor of usage of Affective, Memory, Cognitive, Metacognitive and Social strategies.

METHOD

Sample

The sample was comprised of 382 university students, whose age ranged from 18 to 26 ($M = 19.69$, $SD = 1.96$), and who were mostly female (55%). The examinees were attending the Pre-school Teacher Training College "Mihailo Palov" in Vršac (89) and the Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad (293). Their mother tongue was Serbian and students from the Faculty of

Technical Sciences were learning English as a second language and German as a third. The students from the Preschool Teacher Training College were learning German as a second language, and English as a third language. The minimal duration of English and German language learning was 2 years and maximum 8 years. All of the students were entirely informed about the study and freely accepted to participate without any compensation. They filled in the paper-and-pencil questionnaires at the beginning of their LSP class. The whole procedure lasted 20 minutes.

It is a convenience sample and comprises students with different occupational interests attending different studies at the Faculty of Technical Sciences and Teacher Training College. It is composed of students who were willing to participate in the research and they were studying at the departments of power engineering, architecture, industrial management and teacher training college. The sample included students of different areas of interest, such as power engineering, architecture, entrepreneurship and education.

☞ TABLE 1
Sample structure

Department	N	%
Power Engineering	98	25.65
Architecture	97	25.39
Industrial Management	98	25.65
Teacher Training	89	23.29

Data analysis

In order to address the research questions, Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated and six linear regressions were conducted. Regression analyses were meant to test the predictive role of personality dimensions when language learning strategies were used as a criterion (six analyses for six types of strategies).

Instrument

Goldberg's Big Five Personality Traits from International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg, 2001). The Big Five personality traits were assessed using Goldberg's items from the public domain which were translated into the Serbian language. Each trait was assessed using 10 items followed by a 5-point Likert scale (1 – totally disagree, 5 – totally agree). Reliability of each scale was as follows: *Extraversion* $\alpha = 0.75$, *Conscientiousness* $\alpha = 0.73$, *Agreeableness* $\alpha = 0.77$, *Emotional Stability/Neuroticism* $\alpha = 0.86$ and *Intellect* $\alpha = 0.71$. Personality traits operationalised by this instrument have the status of predictor variables.

Oxford's Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL, 1990) was chosen in preference to others because of its advantages.

According to many authors (Amerstorfer, 2018) SILL remains a useful self-evaluation tool and the most popular instrument in language learning strategy research. It has understandable and clear structural design and it is convenient and easy to use for researchers, teachers, and learners as well. In addition, the SILL has resisted criticism and remains the most frequently used tool for quantitative data collection in language learning strategy research. As it can be easily adapted to suit specific research demands and contexts, it is increasingly integrated into mixed-methods studies as well. It has been translated into more than 20 languages and administered to numerous learners worldwide. It does not lack validity and socio-cultural bias can be overcome after cultural and linguistic adaptation. In addition, Oxford (1996) lists a number of research results which prove its high reliability when translated into a native language of the respondents and then administered.

There are originally two versions of the SILL, both for English speakers learning a new language (version 5.1) and for the speakers of other languages learning English (version 7.0). For the current study, the SILL 7.0 version was employed.

The process of adaptation was divided into two stages. First, it was translated into Serbian and then the cross-cultural verification and adaptation was carried out. The translation process consisted of the initial translation which was carried out by three English language teachers with over 20 years' experience of teaching at University of Novi Sad who voluntarily contributed to the study. They had the necessary scientific background in order to understand the concepts and constructs used. They compared their versions and created a new one, and agreed that there were no particular linguistic and semantic issues to be resolved. Then, the questionnaire was translated back into English by a native speaker who was not informed about the concepts under investigation. This procedure improved content validity of the individual items of the questionnaire as it ensured a consistent translation. The back-translation revealed that all items contained the same concepts as the original ones and there was no need for further revision.

The second stage included the expert committee review whose members were selected on the grounds of their profession, knowledge of the languages and familiarity with the student population. Two English language instructors teaching at University of Belgrade were given the translated questionnaire and asked to comment on each item. They agreed that the translation was generally easy to understand and that the students would not have any particular difficulties in comprehension.

In addition, the questionnaire was given to a convenience group of 6 students from the study population. They were exposed to the questionnaire and asked to note down difficulties of language, comprehension, and cultural relevance and were encouraged to comment on the items, which led to the second revision of the translation. The students complied with the translation, which eliminated any comprehension and cultural difficulties.

Oxford's (SILL) (1990) has six strategy groups and fifty items. Essentially, LLSs are divided into two categories (direct and indirect). Direct strategies include Memory strategies (9 items; $\alpha = 0.75$), Cognitive strategies (11 items; $\alpha = 0.84$) and Compensation strategies (6 items; $\alpha = 0.63$). Indirect strategies comprise of Metacognitive strategies (9 items; $\alpha = 0.86$), Affective strategies (6 items; $\alpha = 0.70$) and Social strategies (6 items; $\alpha = 0.75$). The reliability of the scale translated into Serbian language is expressed by the Cronbach alpha coefficient and written in brackets for every strategy group.

TABLE 2
Oxford's (1990, p. 17)
taxonomy of language
learning strategies

Direct strategies	Memory strategies (9 items)	Creating mental linkages Applying images and sounds Reviewing well Employing action
	Cognitive strategies (14 items)	Practising Receiving and sending messages Analysing and reasoning Creating structure for input and output
	Compensation strategies (6 items)	Guessing intelligently Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing
Indirect strategies	Metacognitive strategies (9 items)	Centring your learning Arranging and planning your learning Evaluating your learning
	Affective strategies (6 items)	Lowering your anxiety Encouraging yourself Taking your emotional temperature
	Social strategies (6 items)	Asking questions Cooperating with others Empathising with others

RESULTS

Preliminary analyses were directed towards describing characteristics of variables used in the research. These results were provided in Table 3.

Pearson's correlations between five personality traits and six types of FLLS are presented in the following table (Table 4). According to these results, we can conclude that *Extraversion*

is significantly, positively correlated with Affective strategies; *Conscientiousness* is negatively correlated with Compensation and Metacognitive strategies; *Agreeableness* is positively correlated with Metacognitive strategies and *Intellect* is positively correlated with Cognitive, Metacognitive and Social strategies.

TABLE 3
Descriptive statistics
for the main variables
in the study

	<i>N</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Sk</i>	<i>Ku</i>
Memory strategies	381	9	39	22.76	6.13	-0.06	-0.44
Cognitive strategies	375	14	68	39.29	10.51	0.06	-0.21
Compensation strategies	381	6	28	17.58	4.59	-0.03	-0.32
Metacognitive strategies	381	8	40	26.18	6.79	-0.34	-0.35
Affective strategies	382	6	30	15.48	4.84	0.10	-0.06
Social strategies	381	5	25	15.31	4.59	-0.07	-0.34
Extraversion	379	13	50	31.88	7.07	-0.05	-0.37
Conscientiousness	379	17	50	37.16	6.73	-0.26	-0.32
Agreeableness	377	19	55	38.83	6.09	-0.18	-0.26
Emotional stability	379	10	50	31.49	8.24	-0.05	-0.40
Intellect	380	23	49	36.61	5.20	0.01	-0.46

Note. *Min* – Minimum; *Max* – Maximum; *SD* – Standard Deviation; *Sk* – Skewness; *Ku* – Kurtosis.

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Memory strategies	0.64**	0.32**	0.57**	0.49**	0.46**	-0.03	0.05	-0.06	0.00	0.08
2 Cognitive strategies		0.40**	0.67**	0.33**	0.49**	-0.03	-0.11*	-0.05	0.01	0.18**
3 Compensation strategies			0.29**	0.27**	0.18**	0.09	-0.13*	0.03	0.00	0.05
4 Metacognitive strategies				0.37**	0.59**	-0.02	0.10	0.11*	0.02	0.21**
5 Affective strategies					0.46**	0.13*	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.04
6 Social strategies						0.10	0.08	0.12*	0.01	0.16**
7 Extraversion							0.04	0.16**	0.25**	0.22**
8 Conscientiousness								0.32**	0.28**	0.21**
9 Agreeableness									-0.01	0.27**
10 Emotional stability										0.15**

TABLE 4
Pearson's correlations
between personality
traits and language
learning strategies

Note. 11 – Intellect. ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$.

The results obtained using linear regression are presented in Table 5. According to them, four out of six tested models reached statistical significance. In significant models, criterion variables were Cognitive, Compensation, Metacognitive and Social strategies. Predictors explain close to 4% of the variance of Compensation strategies and Social strategies, close to 5% of the variance of Metacognitive strategies and 7% of the variance of Cognitive strategies. This is a small to medium effect (Cohen, 1992). According to Cohen, the range between 2 and 13% of the variance is recommended as a "cut off" value for the small size of the effect in regression.

In the following table (Table 6) values of the beta coefficient were presented for all predictors used in the first six analyses. It seems that *Conscientiousness* is a statistically signi-

ificant predictor of Cognitive and Compensation strategies, meaning that lower levels of this trait are followed by greater usage of these two language learning strategies. In addition, *Intellect* seems to play a significant role in predicting Cognitive, Metacognitive and Social strategies (higher levels of these traits are related to greater usage of these strategies). Finally, *Extraversion* reached a statistically significant relative contribution in prediction of Affective strategies, but it is worth noting that this overall model was not statistically significant.

☞ TABLE 5
Criteria's variance explained by five personality traits and results of significance testing for these models

Criterion	R^2	F	$df1$	$df2$	p	f^2
Memory strategies	0.017	1.247	5	363	0.287	0.017
<i>Cognitive strategies</i>	0.070	5.366	5	357	0.000	0.075
<i>Compensation strategies</i>	0.035	2.591	5	362	0.026	0.036
<i>Metacognitive strategies</i>	0.049	3.715	5	362	0.003	0.051
Affective strategies	0.028	2.065	5	363	0.069	0.028
<i>Social strategies</i>	0.037	2.750	5	362	0.019	0.038

☞ TABLE 6
Relative predictive power of personality dimensions for six types of language learning strategies

Predictor	β					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Extraversion	-0.026	-0.082	0.057	-0.065	0.167**	0.072
Conscientiousness	0.059	-0.149**	-0.183**	0.039	0.043	0.045
Agreeableness	-0.111	-0.067	0.067	0.043	-0.049	0.054
Emotional stability	-0.018	0.028	0.043	-0.007	-0.069	-0.049
Intellect	0.094	0.246***	0.039	0.199***	-0.068	0.125*

Note. 1 – Memory strategies; 2 – Cognitive strategies; 3 – Compensation strategies; 4 – Metacognitive strategies; 5 – Affective strategies; 6 – Social strategies. *** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$.

The obtained results show that:

The first hypothesis H1: "*Extraversion* is a positive predictor of usage of all six types of language learning strategies measured by SILL" has been confirmed only for affective strategies.

The second hypothesis H2: "*Agreeableness* is a positive predictor of usage of affective strategies" has been rejected.

The third hypothesis H3: "*Intellect* is a positive predictor of usage of all six types of language learning strategies measured by SILL" has been confirmed only for cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

The fourth hypothesis H4: "*Conscientiousness* is a positive predictor of usage of all six types of language learning strategies measured by SILL" has been confirmed for cognitive and compensation strategies, but in a negative relation.

The fifth hypothesis H5: "*Emotional stability* is a positive predictor of using affective, memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies" has been rejected.

DISCUSSION

This study casts a light on the predictive role of personality dimensions in using language learning strategies proposed by Oxford (1990). According to Oxford, FLLS can be described as specific actions, steps, behaviours, or techniques to deal with a difficult language task. In addition, personality traits may facilitate or hinder the effective use of strategies. They can provide the motivational desire or hindrance to use or not to use learning strategies and thus foster or inhibit language learning activity. Also, if there are initial shortcomings and failures in language learning, a person may try again or leave the learning activity, depending on the personality traits. Therefore, the results of the study made a significant contribution by taking into account all the personality traits according to the Big Five Model and their predictive role in context of six learning strategies according to the SILL questionnaire, within one single research.

In the current research, by using the data presented above, it can be concluded that among five personality traits *Extraversion* is a positive predictor of affective strategies, which are concerned with the learners' emotional requirements, such as confidence. But it must be noted that this overall model was not statistically significant, hence it should be further investigated. Unlike it was expected, *Agreeableness* did not prove to be a significant predictor of affective strategies. On the other hand, this result is in line with those reported by Fazeli (2011b).

In addition, our findings state that *Intellect* is a positive predictor of cognitive and metacognitive strategies. This finding can be understood in the context of intellectual curiosity and tendency to learn new things, which are assumed by this personality dimension. The respondents who have high scores on *Intellect* are probably more prone to engage cognitively in general, and consequently to use cognitive and metacognitive FLLS more often. *Conscientiousness* seems to function as a predictor for cognitive and compensation strategies, but in a negative relation. In the academic context, *Conscientiousness* refers to how organised, disciplined, determined and thorough an individual is in the learning process. The fact that it is negatively related to cognitive and compensation strategies suggests that when students feel less organised, or perform defiantly, they employ these strategies, perhaps by trying to overcome the problems that occur, since cognitive strategies are mental strategies learners use to make sense of their learning and compensation strategies help them to overcome knowledge gaps and continue the communication. In other words, the tendency of those who score low on *Conscientiousness* to rely on cognitive strategies may be understood as relying on previous experiences with foreign language from everyday

life. In a similar manner, usage of Compensation strategies may serve as a way of improvising when continuous hard work is left out. These results are contrary to the hypothesis and previous findings reported by Fazeli (2012a) implying a positive correlation among these variables.

The research noted that *Emotional stability* is insignificant in the selection of FLLS and the frequency of its use, which is contrary to the finding that more Neurotic students use less Social strategies (Fazeli, 2012c) and Metacognitive strategies (Fazeli, 2012e).

To sum up, two out of five personality traits from this study seem to have an important role in the prediction of the FLLS type used. While low *Conscientiousness* was predictive of more frequent usage of Cognitive and Compensation strategies, high *Intellect* was predictive of more frequent usage of Cognitive and Metacognitive strategies. Hence, it can be assumed that using these strategies is at least partially determined by personality, but it is worth noticing that the personality dimension explains relatively little variance of each of the strategies. This leads to the assumption that there are other important factors that influence the usage of (different types of) FLLS besides personality. It would be of high importance to investigate in the future whether there is any different impact of these FLLS on performance and academic achievement and if that relation is moderated by personality. Also, taking into account previous mixed findings, usually obtained using small sample sizes (which is also a shortcoming of this study), replication studies are needed to increase the generalisation of findings.

The findings of this research confirmed the results of previous studies emphasising that in the field of psychology of individual differences (contemporary personality psychology) a person can be described with five major characteristics or basic dimensions. Each of these basic dimensions includes a series of specific personality traits and tendencies towards certain patterns of behaviour. The findings of the research on personality traits, as well as their inclusion in other theoretical constructs (cognitive style ...) support the fact of the previous methodological weaknesses, that is, the fact of idiosyncraticity, elusiveness as the most distinctive feature of human nature, which is also manifested here clearly. With the current methodological powers it is hoped that one day we shall be closer to it, get to know it better in order to serve it better. The present findings are in favour of the conclusion that students should be grouped according to their individualities or individual personalities, with more or less expressed characteristics of different personality traits, and different learning materials and contents should be applied in teaching and

learning activity. Thus, the tendency of grouping individuals according to their personality traits can be realised, and on this basis personalisation of education should be accomplished. This implies that the teacher should offer more access to learning, and thus, didactic apparatus implies a wider repertoire of strategies that attempts to encourage students to take adequate, thus, effective approaches to their own learning. But, as different contents have to be accessed in a variety of ways, it is advisable that the individual is directed towards those ways that are not entirely in line with his/her personality structure or other constructs (cognitive style, learning style ...), in order to develop them to some extent.

The findings of the research (Kvaščev, 1980; Gojkov, 2013; Kozhevnikov, 2007, 2013; Kozhevnikov, Kosslyn, & Shephard, 2005) are in line with the conclusion that the knowledge of students' personality traits is very important for teachers, because they provide a framework of differences, where individual similarities in their variety are manifested through personality traits, significant characteristics of perception, thinking ... (individuals have their own line of personality traits that respond to problem solving), and the teacher, by knowing different structures of the line on one hand and learning strategies on the other, may give a chance to students to put into function the expressed traits, but also to develop to some extent those less pronounced, which are also necessary on certain occasions (Sternberg, 1988, 2000, Stankov, 1986).

CONCLUSION

This research is more comprehensive than the previous studies that dealt with personality and language learning strategy characteristics, while trying to answer this question by using a more advanced statistical method compared to conclusions based solely on simple correlations. One of its major contributions is that it provides findings that will help language teachers select appropriate learning strategies for students, considering their different personality types, and thus, encourage and support better academic achievement. Dissemination of the research results will be beneficial for language teachers and students since this type of study has never been carried out in this region before. Foreign language teachers should also be sensitive to individual learning style differences in educational settings. As personality traits seem to be relatively stable and difficult for students to change, it is suggested that teachers try to adjust their teaching styles to accommodate students' personalities. Learners have control over their learning strategies and can change them much more easily than their personality traits. Therefore, it is suggested that language teachers adopt teaching methodologies that suit

students' learning strategies in order to help them understand and master language learning content. Moreover, as learning strategies are not mutually exclusive, the use of a variety of language learning strategies may assist students in successfully integrating, understanding, and retaining the subject-matter and the teaching topics. When students' personality types successfully interact with the employed learning strategies, students' objectives and achievement, the learning process progresses smoothly. Students' abilities, interests, and expectations should be met while selecting teaching materials and methodology. Due to being able to provide assistance to students, teachers require complete information about the notion of learning strategies, how to make them efficient for certain assignments, and how to deliver strategy instructions. It points out the significance of dealing with individuals by emphasising individual differences in learning strategies, rather than by depending on personality stereotypes.

REFERENCES

- Amerstorfer, C. M. (2018). Past its expiry date? The SILL in modern mixed-methods strategy research. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 497–523. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.14>
- Blickle, G. (1996). Personality traits, learning strategies, and performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 10(5), 337–352. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0984\(199612\)10:5<337::AID-PER258>3.3.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(199612)10:5<337::AID-PER258>3.3.CO;2-Z)
- Carlo, D. S. (2016). The use of learning strategies among learners of Spanish: An empirical study. *Porta Linguarum*, 26, 81–92. Available at <http://www.ugres.local/portalin>
- Carrell, P. L., & Monroe, L. B. (1993). Learning styles and composition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(2), 148–162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1993.tb01958.x>
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2008). Personality, intelligence and approaches to learning as predictors of academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44(7), 1596–1603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.01.003>
- Chen, M., & Hung, L. (2012). Personality type, perceptual style preferences, and strategies for learning English as a foreign language. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(9), 1501–1510. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2012.40.9.1501>
- Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using second language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Cohen, J. (1992). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ehrman, M. (1990). Owls and doves: Cognition, personality, and learning success. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Linguistics, language teaching, and language acquisition: The interdependence of theory, practice, and research* (pp. 413–437). Washington DC: George-town University Press.

Ehrman, M. E. (2008). Personality and good language users. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 61–72). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511497667.007>

Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal* 74(3), 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1990.tb01069.x>

Ehrman, M. E. & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *Modern Language Journal*, 79(1), 67–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb05417.x>

Ellis, R. (2004). Individual differences in second language learning. In A. Davies, & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 525–551). Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470757000.ch21>

Fan, M. Y. (2003). Frequency of use, perceived usefulness, and actual usefulness of second language vocabulary strategies: A Study of Hong Kong learners. *Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), 222–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00187>

Fazeli, S. H. (2011a). The relationship between the neuroticism trait and use of the English Language Learning Strategies. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v3i1.963>

Fazeli, S. H. (2011b). The impact of personality traits on the affective category of English Language Learning Strategies. *LiBRI. Linguistic and Literary Broad Research and Innovation*, 2(2), 125–138. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.3.531-539>

Fazeli, S. H. (2012a). The overall relationships between the use of English Language Learning Strategies and personality traits among the female university level learners of English language as a university major. *Indian Journal of Innovations and Development*, 1(7), 523–532.

Fazeli, S. H. (2012b). The role of personality traits in the choice and use of the compensation category of English Language Learning Strategies. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 5(6), 2938–2944.

Fazeli, S. H. (2012c). Personality traits as predictors of the Social English Language Learning Strategies. *International Journal of Behavioral Social and Movement Sciences*, 1(3), 9–22.

Fazeli, S. H. (2012d). The exploring nature of methodology in the current studies of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) with focus on Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) of Rebecca L. Oxford. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.3.500-507>

Fazeli, S. H. (2012e). Use of the metacognitive English Language Learning Strategies based on personality traits. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(3), 531–539. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.3.531-539>

Furnham, A. (1992). Personality and learning style: A study of three instruments. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13(4), 429–438. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(92\)90071-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90071-V)

Galbraith, V., & Gardner, R. C. (1988). *Individual difference correlates of second-language achievement: An annotated bibliography*. London: University of Western Ontario.

Gojkov, G. (2013). *Fragmenti visokoškolske didaktike (Fragments of high-*

er education didactics). Vršac: VŠSSV M. Palov.

Goldberg, L. R. (2001). *International personality item pool*. Available at <http://bit.ly/1AfXuFc>

Kato, F. (2009). Student preferences: Goal-setting and self-assessment activities in a tertiary education environment. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(2), 177–200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809103447>

Kayaoglu, M. N. (2013). Impact of extraversion and introversion on language learning behaviors. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 41(5), 819–826. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2013.41.5.819>

Kozhevnikov, M. (2007). Cognitive styles in the context of modern psychology: Toward an integrated framework of cognitive style. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(3), 464–481. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.3.464>

Kozhevnikov, M. (2013). Cognitive style. In D. Reisberg (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of cognitive psychology* (pp. 842–855). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195376746.013.0053>

Kozhevnikov, M., Kosslyn, S., & Shephard, J. (2005). Spatial versus object visualizers: A new characterization of visual cognitive style. *Memory & Cognition*, 33(4), 710–726. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03195337>

Kvaščev, R. (1980). *Sposobnosti za učenje i ličnost (Learning abilities and personality)*. Beograd. Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Leaver, B. L., Ehrman, M. E., & Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving success in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610431>

McKay, S. (2006). *Researching second language classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617378>

Mijušković, M., & Simović, S. (2016). The 21st century English language reading classroom in Montenegro: The influence of meta-cognitive strategies on University students' attitudes regarding the process of reading in English. *Porta Linguarum* (26), 23–36. Available at <http://www.ugr.es/local/portalin>

Molaei, A. (2013). The impact of conscientiousness personality trait on Language Learning Strategy application in EFL context. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2).

Mumford, M. D., & Gustafson, S. B. (1988). Creativity syndrome: Integration, application and innovation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(1), 27–43. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.103.1.27>

Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Obralic, N., & Mulalic, A. (2017). Correlation between personality traits and Language Learning Strategies among IUS Students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(5), 76–84.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524490>

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies, what every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers. A Division of Wadsworth, Inc.

Oxford, R. L. (1992). Instructional implications of gender differences in second/foreign language learning styles and strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, 4(1&2), 65–94.

Oxford, R. L. (1996). *Language Learning Strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.

Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos, M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 291–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb06367.x>

Oxford, R. L., & Ehrman, M. (1995). Adult's language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23(3), 359–386. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00023-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00023-D)

Rotgans, J., & Schmidt, H. (2010). The motivation strategies for learning questionnaire: A measure for students' general beliefs and learning strategies. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 19(2), 357–369. <https://doi.org/10.3860/taper.v19i2.1603>

Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Sharp, A. (2008). Personality and second language learning. *Asian Social Science*, 4(11), 17–25. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v4n11p17>

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Stankov, L. (1986). Kvaschev's experiment: Can we boost intelligence? *Intelligence*, 10, 209–230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896\(86\)90016-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896(86)90016-4)

Sternberg, R. J. (1988). *The triarchic mind: A new theory of human intelligence*. New York: Viking. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-9437-5_3

Sternberg, R. J., & Zhang, (2000). L. F. styles of thinking as basis of differentiated instruction. *Theory into Practice*, 44(3), 245–253. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4403_9

Zhang, L. (2003). Does the big five predict learning approaches? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(8), 1431–1446. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(02\)00125-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00125-3)

Uloga osobina ličnosti u izboru i upotrebi strategija učenja jezika

Jelisaveta ŠAFRANJ
Fakultet tehničkih znanosti, Novi Sad
Aleksandra GOJKOV-RAJIĆ
Učiteljski fakultet, Beograd

Cilj je ovog rada istražiti odnose između strategija učenja stranog jezika i osobina ličnosti među studentima pedagoških i inženjerskih znanosti. Kvantitativno istraživanje upitnika o vlastitoj prijavi uzeto je za procjenu strategija učenja i individualnih osobina ličnosti. Izračunani su Pearsonovi koeficijenti korelacije, a šest linearnih regresija provedeno je kako bi se testirala predikтивna uloga dimenzija

DRUŠ. ISTRAŽ. ZAGREB
GOD. 28 (2019), BR. 4,
STR. 691-709

ŠAFRANJ, J.,
GOJKOV-RAJIĆ, A.:
THE ROLE OF...

ličnosti kada su strategije učenja jezika upotrijebljene kao kriterij. Rezultati sugeriraju da studenti s različitim osobinama ličnosti imaju različite preferencije kada su u pitanju strategije učenja. Čini se da dvije od pet osobina ličnosti iz ove studije imaju važnu ulogu u predviđanju jezične strategije. Dok je niska savjesnost bila prediktivna za češću upotrebu kognitivnih i kompenzacijskih strategija, visok intelekt bio je prediktivan za češću upotrebu kognitivnih i metakognitivnih strategija. Studija upozorava na važnost upravljanja studentima kroz zadovoljavanje njihovih osobnih razlika u odabiru strategija učenja, a ne oslanjajući se na stereotipe osobnosti koji prevladavaju. Dobiveni rezultati mogu pomoći u odabiru odgovarajuće strategije učenja koja odgovara osobnosti studenta.

Ključne riječi: strategije učenja jezika, SILL, osobine ličnosti, model "Big Five", studenti sveučilištarci



Međunarodna licenca / International License:
Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno/ Attribution-NonCommercial