

Uncovering Effective Factors in the Success of “Good English Learners”: The Role of out-of-Class Learning Strategies and Extroversion / Introversion

Narjis Faris Abdullah¹

Email: narjis.faris@stu.edu.iq

¹ Southern Technical University, Basrah Technical Institute, Iraq, Basrah

Received: August 1, 2024

Received in Revised: August 13, 2024

Accepted: September 2, 2024

Abstract

This study aims at investigating what makes EFL learners as being good learners and if there is a significant relationship between good English language learners and the strategies they tend to use. In addition, it aims at investigating whether the good English language learners are extravert or introvert personality type. To do so the researchers select two factors which they thought may be influential: out -of- class strategies (OCS), and Extravert/introvert personality type. To accomplish the goals of this study, 63 students of English department at Ferdowsi university and Imam Reza university in Mashhad, Iran at the level of B.A, M.A, & Ph.D were handed two types of questionnaire to figure out the effect of their academic level and personality type on learning strategies they tend to use to improve their language proficiency. The results shows that the most frequent used strategy is the social one more than cognitive and metacognitive with the highest average mean score. However, the results show that the students are introverts more than extraverts. The results will be discussed in more details in this study.

Keywords: Extraversion, Introversion, Learning Strategies

Introduction

Language learning style and strategies are among the basic factors that help in determining how- and how well the students learn second language or foreign language. Language learning strategies (LLS) concern with the students’ thoughts and processes or actions they do to improve and assert their learning. Less successful students can, therefore improve their language performance if they engage in more strategies. In addition, the role of the teacher cannot be deniable, i.e the active role which help in making the students more aware of their language tasks (Cohn, 1998). This notion also adopted by Cook (2008) when he asserted the role of learner training to help the learners being independent inside and outside the classroom. In other words, the idea of learner training means that the learners take the responsibility of their learning throughout the strategies they choose to improve their language.

Significance of the study

In most of the research studies conducted to study learning strategies, much interest have been expressed on these strategies to show how does the learners’ use of them affect their language proficiency. Hence, this study will investigate how the use of these strategies are related to the learner’s personality type: extraverted type or introverted type of personality in correlation with their academic levels. This study aims at investigating the effect the learners’ use of out-of-class strategies on their language proficiency. The relationship between learners’ personality type, i.e. extraversion type or introversion type and their academic achievement.

Review of Literature

Learning style and personality

Learning style has used interchangeably with personality although the former is considered as more variable. the latter indicates a stable characteristic of individual. Learning style in its broader sense means one's preference of gaining, processing and retaining information (Gass & Selinker, 2008). According to the standard definition of learning styles they refer to "an individual's natural, habitual, and preferred way(s) of absorbing, processing, and retaining new information and skills" (Reid 1995 cited in Dörnyei, 2005). The term "styles" which have appeared adjacent in many cases; Brown(2007) defines it as the characteristics and personality types which distinguish people and are generally immutable within an individual. Ellis (2008) mentions Keefe definition of learning style in terms of cognitive traits "the characteristic cognitive, affective and Psychological behaviours that serve as relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with and respond to the learning environment ... Learning style is a consistent way of functioning that reflects underlying causes of behavior (Young, 2010). Therefore, learning style can be distinguished from abilities in that the former constitute preference that direct the learners to how they perceive the learning style rather than their capabilities that decide how well they learn.

Personality as it is mentioned previously is considered as a unique traits or quality that distinguish people. In second language acquisition researches, three main models have been used. First is Eysenck's model of personality which based on three principal personality dimensions: Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism. It is known as (PEN). These dimensions have a biological basis in the sense that Psychoticism is related to aggressivity, Extraversion is related to "cortical arousal", and Neuroticism is related to actions in the presence of danger(Ortega, 2009). A second model of personality was developed by Myres and Briggs. This model concentrates on cognitive style. It consists of four traits: extraversion/introversion, feeling/thinking, perceiving/judging, and intuiting/sensing. This model is usually known as Myres – Briggs Type Indicator.

(MPTI) (ibid). Finally, the big five model which consists of five factors of personality. Each factor originated in some key adjectives associated: (1) Openness to experience: high scorers are imaginative, curious, flexible, creative, moved by art, novelty seeking, originated, and traditional. Low scorers are conservative, down-to-earth, unartistic, and practical. (2) Conscientiousness: high scorers are systematic, meticulous, efficient, organized, reliable, responsible, hard-working, persevering, and self-disciplined; low scorers are unreliable, aimless, careless, disorganized, late, lazy, negligent, and weak-willed. (3) extraversion/introversion: high scorers are sociable, gregarious, active, assertive, passionate, and talkative; low scorers are passive, quiet, reserved, withdrawn, sober, aloof, and restrained. Agreeableness: high scorers are friendly, good nature, likable, kind, forgiving, trusting, cooperative, modest, and generous; low scorers are cold, cynical, rude, unpleasant, critical, antagonistic, suspicious, vengeful, irritable, and uncooperative. Neuroticism-Emotional stability: high scorers are worrying, anxious, insecure, depressed, self-conscious, moody, emotional, and unstable; low scorers are calm, relax, unemotional, hardy, comfortable, content, even tempered, and self- satisfied (Dörnyei, 2005).

Defining learning strategies

Learning strategies are important in the process of second language acquisition. strategies are specific methods by which individuals try to solve problems and are not stable within an individual. These strategies can cover what learners do during the class or what they do out of class. Specifically, learner's strategies have been defined differently by several authors

Weinstein and Mayer 1986 (as cited in Macaro, 2001) define learning strategies in terms of Learner's behaviour and thought. They state that "learning strategies are the behaviour and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning that are intended to influence the learner's encoding process". Similarly, Hardan (2013) defines learning strategies in terms of learner's behaviour. He states that learner's strategies refer to "language learning behaviours learners actually engage in to learn and regulate learning of a second language, what they know about the strategies they use what they know about aspects of their language learning other than the strategies they use".

Others such as Cohen (1996) define learning strategies in terms of learner's action. Chamot, 1987:71 (as cited in Macaro, 2001) says that "learning strategies are techniques approaches or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning and recall of both linguistic and content area information". On the other hand, Cohen (1988) (ibid) defines them as "second language learner strategies encompass both second language learning and second language use strategies. Taken together they constitute the steps or actions consciously selected by learners either for the learning of a second language, the use of it, or both" Go on the same line with Cohen (1996) states his definition of learning strategies as follows "behaviours or actions which the learner use to make language learning more successful, self-directed, and enjoyable (Ellis, 2008). Accordingly, Ellis (2008) refers to O'Malley and Chamot divisions of learner strategies into the following categories: 1) Cognitive strategies; 2) Metacognitive strategies; 3) Socio- affective strategies

As far as cognitive strategies are concerned, they indicate the ways learners use to improve memorizing or repeating keywords silently or loudly. Metacognitive strategies, on the other hand, involves learner's mental process in planning ways of remembering new words, deciding which approach is appropriate to workout grammatical rules, for example, and evaluating the learner's progress, and to find out what he/she need to concentrate on in future. Whereas social and affective strategies (Macaro, 2001) involve the learner interaction with others or asking a teacher for a help, or talking about your feelings and thoughts with someone else. Another type of classification of learning strategies is adopted by Rebecca Oxford listed the above strategies into two groups; cognitive processing, memorizing, and compensation as direct strategies, i.e strategies that directly involve in target language. Whereas metacognitive, social and affective strategies listed as indirect strategies, i.e strategies that provide indirect support for language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities (Ellis, 2008).

Personality type and strategy

The effect of personality type on the use of strategy has been studied by researchers. Ehrman & Oxford 1989, for example, based on a survey, they have investigated the relationship between personality type and strategy use. Their results show that extraverts used two strategies; "affective and visualization" more than introverts (Safdarian et al., 2014). On the other hand, introverts used strategy for searching, for communicating meaning than did extraverts. In addition, they have found that "intuitive people use four strategies; affective, formal model building, authentic language use, and searching for communicating meaning more than sensing people".

In 1990, Ehrman & Oxford conducted another study for searching the same relationship between personality type and strategy use. The participants were adults learning Turkish in US. They indicated that extraverts are social strategy and functional practice strategy oriented whereas introverts preferred learning alone so as to avoid social contact (Cohen & Macaro, 2007). Dörnyei (2005) believes that the relationship between personality type and learning achievement is not "direct and linear but rather indirect". Similarly, Farsides and Woodfield

(2003) point out that personality relation is “a great extent the function of contextual features” Finally, Dörnyei concluded that “even if personality factors do not directly determine the degree of an individual’s academic success, they certainly shape the way people respond to their learning environment (Dörnyei, 2005).

Successful learners and language learning

Many research studies have been made to investigate the relationship between the giftedness and personality traits. The researchers based their studies on the assumption that observed in applied linguistics which says that some language learners are more gifted than others. Hence some researchers such as (Rubin, 1975; Naiman & Sibert, 1978; Stern, 1975), in their studies on good language learner, try to relate personality type factors such as “Extraversion, Willingness to take risk, lack of inhibition, and self-esteem” to successful language learning. Przybył & Pawlak (2023) based on a questionnaire survey, found that the good language learners have certain personality characteristics such as; meticulous, preserving, sociable, independent, inquisitive, involved, organized, active, flexible, assertive, and imaginative(ibid). O’Malley and Chamot, describe the learners who use the metacognitive strategies as the most successful learners because they will be more aware of the whole process of learning a second language. According to Naiman & Sibert (1978) the learners who use social-affective strategies are successful learners due to the fact that they try to reduce their anxiety to make themselves feel able to do the learning task (Macaro, 2001).

Moreover, Chamot & Kupper (1989) assert that the most successful learners are those who use a combination of strategies. In other words, a combination of metacognitive, cognitive, and social-affective strategies in their language learning task. According to Macaro (2001), the learners who use a combination of the top-down and bottom-up processes in, for example, the interpretation of written texts, are the successful learners. He clarifies that the learners, in the former, construct meaning by treating the text as a holistic problem to be solved, whereas in the latter they analyze the words and phrases to construct meaning.

Extraversion Vs. Introversion

The trait of extraversion and introversion were first popularized by Carl Jung. Most of the scholars agree about certain characteristics of extraverts. Ellis (2008), Gass & Selinker, (2008) describe extravert persons as; social, have many friends, risk-takers, live and active, and happier with people than with books. In contrast, introvert persons are those who are;quite, prefer reading to meeting people, have few close friends, much happier with books rather than with people.

Ellis (ibid) highlights the relationship between extraversion / introversion and L2 learning in terms of two major hypotheses. The first which is most widely researched indicates that extraverted learners do better in acquiring basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS). The reason behind such notion is sociability which results in more input and more success in communicating in L2. On the other hand, the second hypothesis indicates that introverted learners do better at developing cognitive academic language ability (CALP), this is due to the fact that such learners spend more times in reading and writing. However; there are certain supports for the first hypothesis and others for the second one. One of the research studies that support the first hypothesis is made by (Strong 1983) when he reviewed the results of 12 studies investigating extraversion traits (i.e. sociality, popularity, outgoingness). In addition to his study on 13 of Spanish speaking kindergarten children, the results of both studied assert extraverted learner’s characteristics. i.e. talkativeness, responsiveness, and gregariousness.

The second hypothesis has received less support. For example, Strong’s survey of studies which investigated the effect of introversion on “linguistic task language” shows that less than

half report a significant relationship. Similarly, Busch (1982) failed to find a significant relationship between introverted learners and language learning when she used Eysenck Personality Inventory to obtain measure of extraversion and introversion. Her result shows that the correlation between introversion and scores four-part written proficiency tests were non-significant.

Methods

The participants of this study consist of 63 students randomly selected in two Iranian Universities: Ferdawsi and Imam Reza university in Mashhad. The participants are 13 females and 50 males majoring in B.A, M.A, and Ph.D level. 50 out of them are Iranian students and 13 are Iraqi speaking Persian and Arabic as their native languages respectively. Their ages ranged from 22 to 48. Mean score is 27.33. All of them are studying English as a foreign language. Two types of questionnaires are used in this study. The first consists of two parts: part one is designed for the purpose of gathering the respondents' demographic profile whereas the second part includes 23 items with Likert scale to show what kind of out-of-class strategies the students used to use in order to improve their language proficiency. The second questionnaire includes 30 items which is based on Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ), particularly extraversion Vs. introversion phase.

The data of this study were collected via using two questionnaires. In order to gather the information concerning out-of-class strategies, the researcher uses a questionnaire including 23 items with Likert scale. Following O'Malley and Chamot(1990), the researcher divided the items into three categories: social, cognitive, and metacognitive. The participants were requested to answer the questions by choosing the option that most fit their answers. The second questionnaire includes 30 items which is based on Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ), the items categorized into extraversion Vs. introversion type.

The findings are discussed according to the participants responses by comparing the mean scores. Table (1) compares the mean scores of the B.A, M.A., and the Ph.D Iranian and Iraqi students as far as the strategies they tend to use out of their classes. The results show that the Iranian B.A students tend to use cognitive strategies more than the other two types of strategies, i.e social and metacognitive because their mean score is 13.46 which is the highest. However it does not correlate significantly with the mean score of their average scores = 40.47 which is not the highest comparing with their average mean score of the social strategy in the Nt.= 44.96. e.g they answer the following question as one of the cognitive questions;(Q 6: *I always read English newspapers*). Whereas the M.A students prefer to use the social strategy which correlates significantly with their average mean score = 14.07 and 63.71 respectively. Similarly the Ph.D students tend to use the social strategy which correlates significantly with their average mean score = 19.59 and 87.41 respectively. Going on the same line the Iraqi M.A. students and the Ph.D students as well tend to use the social strategy which correlates significantly with their average mean scores = 13.6 and 54.79 , 22 and 90 respectively. e.g they answer the following question as one of the social questions; (*I try to speak English with those friends of mine who know English*).

Table 1. mean score of out of class strategies

Students	Social strategy					Cognitive strategy					Metacognitive strategy				
	St.diss	Dis.	Nt.	Agr.	St.agg	St.diss	Ds.	Nt.	Agr.	St.agg	St.diss	Dis.	Nt.	Agr.	St. Agr.
B.A	1.30	5.69	7.61	10.1	3.84	0.69	2.67	5.07	10.5	13.4	0.07	0.4	1.1	7.07	6.92
Average mean score	22.6	41.20	44.96	5	13.15	12.11	24.13	34.99	34.08	6	1.53	6	7.8	31.46	24.01

				44.5 7						40.4 7		3.9 8			
M.A Average mean score	0.77 16.1 1	4.45 37.7 2	7.66 44.0 7	14.0 7 63.7 1	6.11 17.1 5	0.73 15.5 8	3.11 28.2 5	5.88 14.0 4	13.1 8 57.9 5	7.22 24.3 8	0.03 0.07	0.2 9 4.5 1	0.6 6 5.4 2	7.70 31.6 2	8.14 33.6 8
Ph.D Average mean score	0.59 11.0 7	3.94 34.4 4	4.49 26.7 7	19.5 9 87.4 1	5.97 23.6 2	1.97 20.6 7	1.59 19.8 5	4.19 25.3 8	15.5 9 70.7 2	6.99 25.1 2	0.28 1.61	0.3 ---- -	1.1 9 8.6 5	7.1 35.8 9	6.99 23.9 0
Iraqi students	----	3%	9%	13.6	10.5	0.6	2.4	9%	8%	12.5	0.1	0.6	1.5	6.8	6.5
M.A Average mean score	-	25.1 7	47.9 4	54.7 9	33.9 5	3.97	19.6 0	47.7 7	32.3 7	41.3 4	1.67	5%	7.9 8	18.7 3	19.9 8
Ph.D Average mean score	---- -	---- -	3%	22%	17.5	8%	---- -	3%	12%	17.5	---- -	---- -	1.5	---- -	17.5
	---- -	---- -	16.2 5	90%	65.2 5	24%	---- -	16.2 5	49%	57%	---- -	---- -	8%	57%	

Table (2) shows the difference in mean scores of the Males and Females concerning the use of strategies and their average mean scores. The high score of the Iranian B.A males students is for the cognitive strategy = 13.46 which does not correlate with their average mean score = 40.47. The M.A males students' high mean score is in social strategy = 14.8 correlates significantly with their average mean score = 46.5 whereas the females' high mean score is for cognitive strategy = 13.14 which does not correlate with their average mean score = 50.51. As far as the Ph.D male students are concerned, the high mean scores are for social strategy and cognitive strategy = 16 for both that correlate significantly with their average mean score = 70.05 and 70.29 respectively. Similarly the female Ph.D students' high mean score is for social strategy = 21.14 that correlates significantly with their average mean score = 94.85. On the other hand, the Iraqi male M.A students' high mean score is for cognitive strategy as well as the female = 16.66 and 12 respectively. The male average mean score correlates significantly = 53.73 with the mean of their strategy but the females do not, mean = 33.39. Finally, the Iraqi Ph.D male students' high mean score is for social strategy = 22 correlates significantly with their average mean score = 90.

Table 2. mean score of out of class strategies and average mean for Males and Females

students	Social strategy					Cognitive strategy					Metacognitive strategy				
	St.d s	Ds.	Nt.	Ag. g	St.a g	St.d s	Ds.	Nt.	Agr .	St.a g	St. ds	Dis .	Nt.	Ag r.	St Agr .
B.A / Male	1.30	5.69	7.61	10.1 5	3.84	0.69	2.76	5.07	10.5	13.4 6	0.0 7	0.4 6	1.6 1	7.0 7	6.9 2
Av. mean	22.6 3	41.2 0	44.9 6	45.7 5	13.1 5	12.1 1	24.1 3	34.9 9	43.0 8	40.4 7	1.5 3	3.9 8	7.8 46	31. 46	24. 01
M.A / Male	0.95	3.62	6%	14.8	7 %	0.85	3.3	5.1	13.2	7.5	0.0 5	0.4	0.9	7.4	7.7 5
Av. mean	15.9 3	32.5 7	27.3 2	46.5	17.2 5	14.4 4	28.3 8	28.1 7	46.2 5	20.9 4	1.5 6	4.9 7	5.9 7	28. 90	26. 20

Female	0.28	2.85	12.4	12	3.57	0.42	2.57	8.14	13.1	6.42	---	---	---	8.5	9.2
Av. mean	5.14	25.5	60.4	67.4	11.7	7.71	7.71	48.5	50.5	16.8	---	---	---	16.	31
Ph.D/ Male	0.66	2%	9%	16	6.6	2%	2%	1%	16	8.33	---	1%	2%	5%	5%
Av. mean	11.2	18.0	52.5	70.0	22.9	33.7	17.8	5.80	70.2	29.4	---	6.0	17.	29.	17.
Female	0.57	4.57	2.57	21.1	5.71	0.71	1.42	5.57	15.4	6.42	0.4	---	0.8	8	7.8
Av. mean	11	41.4	15.7	94.8	23.9	15.0	20.7	33.7	70.9	23.2	2.3	---	5.0	38.	26.
Iraqi students															
M.A/ Male	----	20.3	8.5	13.3	13.3	0.33	20.3	8.5	5.33	16.6	0.1	0.6	1%	8%	5.8
Av. mean	----	19.4	39.9	51.4	42.3	4	18.6	42.9	20.5	53.7	2.7	5.5	5.2	32.	16
Female	----	4%	9.75	3%	6.25	0.25	2.5	9.75	12	6.25	---	1%	2.2	3.7	7.5
Av. mean	----	22.7	37.5	39.9	14.2	2.63	14.0	36.6	33.9	15.1	---	2.7	8.0	14.	17.
Ph.D Male	----	---	3%	22	17.5	8%	----	3%	12	17.5	---	---	1.5	----	17.
Av. mean	----	----	16.2	90	56.2	24	----	16.2	57	49	---	---	8	----	57

Table (3) illustrates the mean scores of the participants' responses and their average mean scores in the second questionnaire concerning the personality type: extraversion Vs. introversion. The results show that the Iranian B. A students are introverts more than extraverts mean score = 14.46 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 63.49. Similarly the M.A students are introverts more than extraverts mean score = 14.37 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 63.63. In addition, the Ph.D A students are also introverts more than extraverts mean score = 17.4 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 80.09. e.g they answer the

following question as one of the introvert questions; (*Q 21, going to large social gatherings exhausts me*). As far as the Iraqi students are concerned, the results show that the M.A students are extraverts more than introverts mean score = 18 which does not correlate significantly with their highest average mean scores in introversion = 95.49. e.g they answer the following question as one of the extravert questions; (*Q 10, I enjoy meeting new people*). On the contrary, the Iraqi Ph.D students are introverts more than extraverts mean score = 35 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 98.

Table 3. mean scores of Extraversion V.s Introversion & Average mean scores

Students	Extraversion					Introversion				
	Exactly Like me	A lot like me	Somewhat like me	A little like me	Not at all like me	Exactly Like me	A lot like me	Somewhat like me	A little like me	Not at all like me
B.A	5.38	12.92	11.67	8.76	2.38	11.53	14.46	10.15	7.69	1.76
Average mean score	19.55	44.86	67.55	75.05	41.75	40.62	63.49	57.87	65.08	29.98
M.A	8.88	11.85	11.11	7.85	2.29	13.70	14.37	10.88	6.44	1.55

Average mean score	29.12	46.32	51.19	66.38	44.45	45.46	63.63	61.28	54.78	23.50
Ph.D Average mean score	11.5	10%	10.7	8%	1.6	12.5	17.4	11.7	4.8	1.7
Iraqi students M.A Average mean score	39.40	44.36	81.70	72.90	28.63	47.57	80.09	70.79	42.87	9.61
Ph.D Average mean score	7.5	18%	12.9	5%	2.1	10%	14.8	17.7	4.4	1.1
Ph.D Average mean score	23.71	71.78	69.98	41.47	33.05	28.25	54.02	95.46	36.78	17.77
Ph.D Average mean score	27.5	16%	1.5	2%	4%	35%	12%	9%	-----	65%
Ph.D Average mean score	89.5	65.25	8 %	16%	65%	98%	49%	48.25	-----	32%

Table (5) shows the difference between the male and female as far as their personality type. The results show that the Iranian B.A students are introverts more than extraverts ,mean score = 14.46 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 63.49. Similarly the M.A male students are introverts more than extraverts ,mean score = 14.2 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 60.07 as well as the female students who are introverts mean score = 77.84 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 14.85. The Ph.D male students are also introverts with mean score = 18.66 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 99.9. The Ph.D female students are also introverts with mean score = 17.71 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 79.13 In contrast, the Iraqi M.A male students are extraverts with mean score= 20.66 and similarly with mean score = 20.66 for introversion. However, their highest mean score for introversion correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 96.90 than with the mean score of the extraversion. Whereas the Iraqi M.A female students are introverts with mean score = 16.5 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 93.29. Finally, the results show that the Iraqi Ph.D students are introverts with mean score = 35 which correlates significantly with their highest average mean scores = 98.

Table 5. mean score of Extraversion V.s Introversion and average mean scores for male and female

Students	Extraversion					Introversion				
	Exactl y Like me	A lot like me	Somewh at like me	A little like me	Not at all like me	Exactl y Like me	A lot like me	Somewh at like me	A little like me	Not at all like me
Iranian students										
B.A/ Male av.mean	5.38	12.92	11.67	8.76	2.38	11.53	14.46	10.15	7.69	1.76
M.A/ Male av.mean	19.55	44.86	67.55	75.05	41.75	40.62	63.49	57.87	65.08	29.98
Female Av.mean	9.25	12.8	10.5	7.5	2.7	13.75	14.2	10.8	6.6	1.65
Ph.D/ Male av.mean	29.83	51.78	58.15	63.41	45.51	45.32	58.66	60.07	55.77	26.48
Female av.mean	27.08	38.6	73.45	74.85	41.42	45.87	77.84	64.75	51.95	15%
Ph.D/ Male av.mean	7.85	9.14	12.85	8.85	2.42	13.57	14.85	11.14	6	0.85
Ph.D/ Male av.mean	10%	12%	15%	8%	1%	8.33	18.66	17%	3.33	1.33
Female av.mean	28.81	52.67	87.28	71.90	17.55	34.61	82.33	99.9	29.66	22.50
Female av.mean	12.14	9.14	8.85	8%	13.85	14.28	17.71	9.42	5.42	1.85
Female av.mean	43.94	40.80	79.31	73.32	33.38	53.13	79.13	58.32	48.53	31.60
Iraqi students	7.5	20.66	13.5							

M.A/ Male	22.47	80.69	71.08	4.33	1.66	9.16	20.66	18.5	3%	0.33
Av .mean				35.32	21.92	20.62	81.60	96.90	22.93	4.60
Female av.mean	7.5 25.56	14% 58.42	12% 68.33	6% 50.70	2.75 49.75	11.25 39.7	6% 25.55	16.5 93.29	6.5 57.65	2.25 37.52
Ph.D/Male av.mean	27.5 89.5	16% 65.25	1.5 8 %	2% 16%	4% 65%	35% 98%	12% 49%	9% 48.25	16% -----	65% 32%

Conclusion

The analysis of the results shows that the most frequent used strategy is the social one i.e mean score = 79.36 which correlates significantly with the average mean score = 68.24. Whereas the analysis of the personality type shows that mean score of the Introversion = 84.12 which correlates significantly with the average mean score = 55.23 . (Macaro, 2001) illustrates that social and affective strategies involve the learner interaction with others or asking a teacher for a help, or talking about your feelings and thoughts with someone else. Ellis (2008), Gass & Selinker, (2008) describe introvert persons are those who are; quite, prefer reading to meeting people, have few close friends, much happier with books rather than with people. This leads us to conclude, first that there is no significant correlation between the strategies used by the learner and his personality type. Second, according to Naiman et al. the learners who use social-affective strategies are successful learners due to the fact that they try to reduce their anxiety to make themselves feel able to do the learning task (Macaro, 2001), the results of this study support Naiman et al. Claim.

References

- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extraversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language learning*, 32(1), 109-132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1982.tb00521.x>
- Cohen, A. D. (1996). *Second language learning and use strategies: Clarifying the issues*.
- Cohen, D. & Macaro, E (2007) *Language Learner Strategies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, D. Andrew (1998) *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Cook, V.(2008) *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Hodder Education
- Dörnyei, Z(2005) *The Psychology of Language Learner*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Ellis, Rod (2008) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gass, M. S. & Slinker, L. (2008) *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. New York : Routledge.
- Hardan, A. A. (2013). Language learning strategies: A general overview. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 1712-1726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.194>
- Macaro, E. (2001) *Learning Strategies in foreign and second language classroom*. Great Britain: CPD, Ebbow Vale

- Naiman, R. J., & Sibert, J. R. (1978). Transport of nutrients and carbon from the Nanaimo River to its estuary 1. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 23(6), 1183-1193. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1978.23.6.1183>
- Ortega, Lourdes (2009) *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Great Britain: Hodder Education.
- Przybył, J., & Pawlak, M. (2023). *Personality as a factor affecting the use of language learning strategies: The case of university students*. Springer Nature.
- Safdarian, Z., Ghyasi, M., & Farsani, M. A. (2014). How reading strategy use and personality types are related. *Reading*, 14(1), 121-135.
- Strong, M. (1983). Social styles and the second language acquisition of Spanish-speaking kindergartners. *TESOL quarterly*, 17(2), 241-258. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586652>
- Young, T. (2010). How valid and useful is the notion of learning style? A multicultural investigation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 427-433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.037>