



**English Language Learning Strategies and Personality Traits:  
A Comparison of Muslim and Non-Muslim Students**

**Munir Laeha**

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts in Teaching English as an International Language  
Prince of Songkla University**

**2015**

**Copyright of Prince of Songkla University**

**Thesis** English Language Learning Strategies and Personality Traits:  
A Comparison of Muslim and Non-Muslim Students

**Author** Munir Laeha

**Major Program** Teaching English as an International Language

---

**Advisor**

.....  
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nisakorn Charumanee)

**Examining Committee:**

.....Chairperson  
(Dr. Pittayatorn Kaewkong)

.....  
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nisakorn Charumanee)

.....  
(Dr. Usa Intharaksa)

The Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University, has approved this thesis as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree in Teaching English as an International Language.

.....  
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Teerapol Srichana)  
Dean of Graduate School

This is to certify that the work here submitted is the result of the candidate's own investigation. Due acknowledgement has been made of any assistance received.

.....Signature  
(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nisakorn Charumanee)  
Advisor

.....Signature  
(Munir Laeha)  
Candidate

I hereby to certify that this work has not already been accepted in substance for any degree, and is not being currently submitted in candidature for any degree.

.....Signature

(Munir Laeha)

Candidate

ชื่อวิทยานิพนธ์	กลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษและบุคลิกภาพ : การเปรียบเทียบระหว่าง นักเรียนมุสลิมและนักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิม
ผู้เขียน	นายมนูรี แลสะ
ปีการศึกษา	2557

### บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อเปรียบเทียบการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ (language learning strategies) และบุคลิกภาพโดยเฉพาะแบบเปิดเผย (extroversion) และเก็บตัว (introversion) ของนักเรียนที่มีภาษาแม่ต่างกัน ได้แก่ นักเรียนที่เป็นมุสลิม และนักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิม งานวิจัยนี้ใช้การสุ่มแบบเจาะจง (purposive sampling) นักเรียนถูกแบ่งเป็นกลุ่มมุสลิมที่มีคะแนนสูงและต่ำ และนักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมที่มีคะแนนสูงและต่ำตามเกณฑ์คะแนนภาษาอังกฤษ จากผลการสอบ O-NET วิชาภาษาอังกฤษ เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการเก็บข้อมูล ประกอบด้วย 1) แบบสอบถามกลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษและ 2) แบบสอบถามวัดบุคลิกภาพ 3) แบบสัมภาษณ์กลุ่ม ผลที่ได้จากงานวิจัยพบว่า นักเรียนในกลุ่มวิจัยเป็นผู้ใช้กลยุทธ์การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษในระดับปานกลางและ นักเรียนที่มีคะแนนสูงทั้งมุสลิมและไม่ใช่มุสลิมใช้กลยุทธ์โดยรวมมากกว่านักเรียนที่มีคะแนนต่ำกว่า นักเรียนกลุ่มที่มีคะแนนสูงทั้งมุสลิมและที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมมีการใช้กลวิธีการเรียนทางอ้อม (indirect strategies) มากกว่ากลวิธีการเรียนทางตรง (direct strategies) และไม่พบความแตกต่างของระดับการใช้ ทั้งสองกลุ่มใช้กลวิธีเชิงอภิปัญญา (metacognitive strategies) มากที่สุด อย่างไรก็ตามกลุ่มนักเรียนมุสลิมที่มีคะแนนสูงใช้กลวิธีการจดจำ (memory strategies) และ กลวิธีด้านอารมณ์และจิตใจ (affective strategies) มากกว่ากลุ่มที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ ผลแบบเดียวกันนี้ปรากฏเมื่อเปรียบเทียบนักเรียนที่มีคะแนนต่ำระหว่างกลุ่มนักเรียนมุสลิมและที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิม ยกเว้นประเด็นการใช้กลวิธีเชิงอภิปัญญา (metacognitive strategies) ซึ่งนักเรียนมุสลิมระบุการใช้มากกว่าอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ จากผลการวิจัยอาจกล่าวได้ว่านักเรียนทั้งหมดมีแนวโน้มที่จะใช้กลวิธีการเรียนทางอ้อม (กลวิธีเชิงอภิปัญญา; metacognitive strategies, กลวิธีด้านอารมณ์และจิตใจ; affective strategies , กลวิธีด้านสังคม; social strategies ) และหลีกเลี่ยงการใช้กลยุทธ์ที่ซับซ้อน นักเรียนมุสลิมใช้กลยุทธ์แบบท่องจำ ในการเรียนรู้ภาษา ในขณะที่นักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิม

มักใช้กลวิธีทางสังคม. นอกจากนี้ นักเรียนมุสลิมที่มีคะแนนสูงมีบุคลิกแบบเก็บตัว และนักเรียนที่มีคะแนนต่ำมีบุคลิกแบบเปิดเผย ในขณะที่นักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมทั้งสองกลุ่มแสดงบุคลิกแบบเปิดเผย

**คำสำคัญ :** กลวิธีการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษ, บุคลิกภาพแบบเปิดเผย, บุคลิกภาพแบบเก็บตัว, นักเรียนที่มีคะแนนสูง , นักเรียนที่มีคะแนนต่ำ, นักเรียนมุสลิม, นักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิม

<b>Thesis Title</b>	English Language Learning Strategies and Personality Traits: A Comparison of Muslim and Non-Muslim Students
<b>Author</b>	Munir Laeha
<b>Major Program</b>	Teaching English as an International Language
<b>Academic Year</b>	2014

### ABSTRACT

This study aimed to compare English language learning strategies (LLSs) use and personality traits specifically extroversion and introversion among and within two different ethnicities or language background groups: Muslim and non-Muslim students. The study employed purposive sampling. The participants in the study were divided into Muslim high and low achievers and non-Muslim high and low achievers based on English scores in O-NET Test (Ordinary National Education Test). The instruments were 1) a language learning strategies questionnaire, and 2) a personality traits questionnaire and 3) a guided interview form. The results showed that these learners are moderate ELLSs users and the Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers used more ELLSs than their counterparts. Both the Muslim and the non-Muslim high achievers used indirect strategies more than the direct ones and no significant differences were found. Both used metacognitive the most; however, memory and affective strategies were used significantly more by the Muslim than the non-Muslim high achievers. These similar results were found when compared between the Muslim and the Non-Muslim low achievers except that the Muslim low achievers used metacognitive significantly more. It can be concluded that most participants tend to develop their English language learning through indirect strategies (metacognitive, affective and social strategies) and avoid using complicated strategies. Muslim students prefer rote learning through memorization to acquire English whereas the non-Muslim apply social strategies. Furthermore, high Muslim achievers were found displaying clear introvert and the low achievers were clear extrovert while non-Muslim participants showed very clear extroversion.

**Keywords:** English language learning strategies (ELLS), extroversion, introversion, high achievers, low achievers, Muslim, non-Muslim



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to gratefully and deeply acknowledge my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nisakorn Charumane, who kindly and patiently dedicated, encouraged, supported and guided me through constructive comments, valued suggestions, and precious guidance and that have led to the completion of the current thesis.

I am also indebted to my thesis and proposal reader, Dr. Usa Intharaksa, and Dr. Sita Musigrungsi for their suggestion on developing my thesis.

Moreover, I would like to spread my gratitude to Dr. Pittayatorn Kaewkong, the chairman of the committee, and again, Dr. Usa Intharaksa, member of the committee for their valuable and precious comments to nurture and fulfill my thesis.

My sincere appreciation must be extended to all instructors in the M.A. program, as well as staff in Teaching English as an International Language, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat-Yai Campus for the knowledge to carry out this research.

I also would like to express my pleasure to English teachers in Darussalam and Naratiwat schools for sacrificing their time in helping me collecting the data and also to Mattayomsuksa 4 students in academic year 2014 in both schools for their cooperation.

My special thanks go to seniors, and friends for their limitless patience, endless encouragement, tremendous support, and understanding, who are ready to sacrifice their time to listen and discuss.

Last but not least, I would like to express my gratitude to my family, whose limitless patience, endless support and encouragement have led me to overcome difficult obstacles during conducting the research.

Munir Laeha

## CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	v
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	ix
<b>CONTENTS</b> .....	x
<b>LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES</b> .....	xiii
<b>LIST OF PAPERS</b> .....	xiv
<b>LETTERS OF ACCEPTANCE</b> .....	xv
<b>A SYNTHESIS REPORT</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>2. RESERCH QUESTIONS</b> .....	4
<b>3. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RELATED STUDIES</b> .....	5
3.1 Language learning strategies.....	5
3.1.1 Definition of language learning strategies.....	5
3.1.2 Classification of language learning strategies.....	6
3.2 Personality traits.....	7
3.3 Related studies.....	9
3.3.1 Language learning strategies and second language proficiency.....	9
3.3.2 Introversion/ extroversion and second language proficiency...	13
<b>4. THE SIGNIFICNACE OF THE STUDY</b> .....	15
<b>5. METHODOLOGY</b> .....	15
5.1 Participants.....	15
5.2 Instrumentations.....	16
5.2.1 The questionnaires.....	16
5.2.2 The guided Interview.....	20
5.3 Data collection.....	21
5.3.1 The questionnaires.....	21
5.3.2 The guided interview.....	22
5.4 Data analysis.....	22

## **CONTENTS (CONTINUED)**

<b>6. RESULTS.....</b>	<b>23</b>
6.1 Strategies used and personality displayed by Muslim high and low achievers.....	23
6.2 Strategies used and personality traits displayed by non-Muslim high and low achiever.....	25
6.3 Comparison of strategies used between Muslim high achievers and non-Muslim high achievers .....	27
6.4 Comparison of strategies used between Muslim low achievers and non-Muslim low achievers.....	28
6.5 Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers.....	29
6.6 Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers.....	30
<b>7. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>8. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>32</b>
8.1 Language learning strategies used among Muslim and non-Muslim students.....	32
8.1.1 Strategies used by Muslim high and low achievers.....	32
8.1.2 Strategies used by non-Muslim high and low achievers.....	33
8.1.3 Similarities and differences in employing English language Learning strategies among Muslim and non-Muslim high and low achievers.....	34
8.2 Personality traits displayed by Muslim and non-Muslim students.....	36
8.2.1 The personality traits of Muslim high and low achievers.....	36
8.2.2 The personality traits of non-Muslim high and low achievers.....	36
8.2.3 The personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim students.....	37
<b>9. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY.....</b>	<b>38</b>
9.1 Language learning strategies.....	38
9.2 Extroversion and introversion personality traits.....	39
<b>10. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>41</b>

## **CONTENTS (CONTINUED)**

### **APPENDICES**

Appendix A English version of language learning strategies questionnaire.....	47
Appendix B English version of personality traits questionnaire.....	53
Appendix C English version of guided interview items.....	57
Appendix D Thai version of language learning strategies questionnaire.....	60
Appendix E Thai version of personality traits questionnaire.....	66
Appendix F Thai version of guided interview items.....	70

### **MANUSCRIPTS**

PAPER 1	English Language Learning Strategies: A comparison between Muslim and Non-Muslim Students.....	73
PAPER 2	Personality Traits: A comparison Study of Muslim and Non-Muslim Students.....	96
<b>VITAE</b> .....		108

## LIST OF TABLES

### TABLE

### A SYNTHESIS REPORT

<b>Table 1:</b>	Type of language learning strategies.....	17
<b>Table 2:</b>	List of language learning strategies items invented by Oxford (1990).....	17
<b>Table 3:</b>	Myer-Briggs Personality Traits taxonomy.....	20
<b>Table 4:</b>	List of extroversion and introversion personality traits items.....	20
<b>Table 5:</b>	The number of participants in this study.....	21
<b>Table 6:</b>	Language learning strategies used by Muslim high and low achievers.....	24
<b>Table 7:</b>	Personality traits of Muslim high and low achievers.....	24
<b>Table 8:</b>	Language learning strategies used by non-Muslim high and low achievers.....	26
<b>Table 9:</b>	Personality traits of non-Muslim high and low achievers.....	26
<b>Table 10:</b>	Language learning strategies used by Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers.....	28
<b>Table 11:</b>	Language learning strategies used by Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers.....	29
<b>Table 12:</b>	Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers.....	30
<b>Table 13:</b>	Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers.....	30
<b>Table 14:</b>	Summary of the findings.....	31

## LIST OF PAPERS

This thesis is based on the following papers:

1. Laeha, M., &Charumanee, N. (summitted manuscript). English language learning strategies: A comparison between Muslim and non-Muslim students. *Journal of liberal Arts*, Prince of Sonhkla University Hat Yai Campus, Hat Yai, Songkla 90110
2. Laeha, M., &Charumanee, N. (2015). Personality traits: A comparison study of Muslim and non-Muslim students. *The 7<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences on "ASEAN 2015: Challenges and Opportunities"* June 6, 2015. Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University Proceedings. Pp. 75-86

## 1. Introduction

A growing number of researches in the field of second language acquisition have prominently shifted over the last few years. The greater emphasize is on learners, the process of learning and individual differences rather than teachers and the process of teaching (Wenden and Rubin, 1987; Yabukoshi and Takeuchi, 2009; Nikoopour and Farsani, 2010). The interest towards learning come together with the emerging trend to develop students' capacity of English knowledge by distinguishing successful and unsuccessful learners (Wharton, 2000) with the belief that what good language learners have been doing to develop their competencies could be transfer and taught to their counterparts (Griffiths and Parr, 2011). Those have led to more investigations and explorations on impact of language learning strategies as "one of the most fertile areas of research in language learning in recent years" MacIntyre (1994), and personality traits which its importance widely has received acceptance in psychological discipline (Deweale, 2012).

Language learning strategies (LLSs) are regularly described as behaviors, techniques, steps, means, plans and sets of operations taken by learners to help and facilitate them in learning language and acquiring as well as mastering new languages (Wenden and Rubin, 1987; Oxford, 1990; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Park 1997). Students normally used the strategy inside and outside the classroom sometimes with the guidance of teachers or with their own effort. Students are believed to use strategies consciously and unconsciously. Those strategies are, for example, remembering and retrieving information, guessing for meaning, using gesture to bridge the gap in communication, scheduling for English review period inside and outside the classroom, finding an opportunity to use English in spoken conversation, and compromising their own emotions to learn language.

The past studies conducted regarding language learning strategies found an impact in relation to language learning' comprehension and performance or to acquire and improve language skills (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Ellis, 1994; Oxford and Ehrman, 1995; Brown, 2000). To further illustrate, extensive studies reveal that most of successful students or students who gain high score in English

normally tried to facilitate their language learning with wider range of strategies than their unsuccessful peers or those who have lower score in English (Green and Oxford, 1995; Wharton, 2000; Gan, Humphreys, and Hamp-Lyons, 2004; Abu Shmais, 2004; Khalil, 2005; Gerami and Baighlou, 2011).

Another variable-specifically, ethnicity which refers to mother tongue or language background of students (Grainger, 1997) is the area that has received less attention and it needs more replication (Ellis, 1994). Some studies indicated that students with different language background prefer LLSs in different fashion. For example, Grainger (1997) found that students who have European background and embrace English as a mother tongue prefer to use social strategies the most, while the Asian background students prefer to employ compensation strategies in English language learning. In 1995, Green and Oxford researched University students in Puerto Rico, where they found that cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, and social strategies were employed to develop language competencies. With the trend of rote learning, Chinese language background students preferred memorization (Qingquan, Chatupote, and Teo, 2008). Furthermore, little exposed to real English communication limited Palestinian students with opportunities of using social strategies (Khalil, 2005).

Individual differences and preferences in the choice of employing language learning strategies is not the only one aspect associated with the success in second language learning, but another important variable is personality traits specifically to extroversion and introversion students have displayed. Based on Eysenck and Eysenck (1985) variation in personality, behavior is associated with cortical arousal. Under-arousal makes extrovert students tend to involve with activities, and over-aroused leads introvert students to avoid arousing situations. To put it more simple, ordinary extrovert are normally talkative, sociable and usually communicate without inhibition, while typical introvert are more reserved, quiet, and sometimes they need time to produce language outcome.

Generally agreed among scholars that the major personality traits specifically extroversion and introversion perform an integral part in language learning (Brown,



2000), an assumption has been made among teachers and language learning observers that the extroversion type of personality trait might reach a greater degree of success in second language learning compared to the introversion types (Rubin, 1975; Kezwer, 1987; Saville-Troike, 2006; Ockey, 2011; Wong, 2011). Since their assertiveness is easily to be noticed, it is convincible enough to attract a teacher to believe in the notion that they are better and more successful in language learning.

However, the inconsistent result is found contrasting with the common belief that students with the tendency of being the extrovert should outpace students with introversion personality in language learning. For example, in EFL context like Japan, Carrell, Prince, and Astika (1996) found introversion gained proficiency score more than their counterpart. Therefore, to conclude the extroversion is better is too extreme.

By virtue of language learning strategies and personality dimensions, there is still a doubt that needs more examination about language learning strategies in relation to cultural background, even though it has been researched for more than 30 years (Grainger, 2012), and as indicated by many researchers EFL contexts are still needed more observations (Gan, Humphreys, and Hamp-Lyons, 2004). Moreover, the importance of behavioral reactions of extroversion and introversion trait is still demanding for more studies (Wilt and Revelle, 2009). Thus, this research aimed to compare similarities and differences of those aspects-*LLSs and personality traits*-related to proficiency and language learning, specifically, among those students living in the three southern provinces of Thailand where there are two ethnicities; Muslim and Non-Muslim populations (Vallin and Akesson, 2012). Muslim students possess Melayu language as their mother tongue and non-Muslim are those acquire Thai language as their mother tongue.

### **1.1 Definition of Terms**

The key terms used in this study were as follows:

1. English language learning strategies referred to “specific actions taken by the learners to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situation” (Oxford, 1990)

2. Personality traits referred to in this study divided into two dimensions:
  - a. Extroversion personality referred to the state related to being talkative, sociable, person-oriented, active, and eager to express feelings with preference to group working (Leaver, Ehrman, and Shekhtman, 2005).
  - b. Introversion personality referred to the state of being reserved, task-oriented, quiet, prefer to work alone and need space (Leaver, Ehrman, and Shekhtman, 2005).
3. *Students* in the study referred to:
  - Mathayomsuksa 4 Muslim students who studied at Darussalam school in the 2014 academic year.
  - Mathayomsuksa 4 non-Muslim students who studied at Narathiwat School in the 2014 academic year.
4. *Muslim Students* referred to Muslim students who studied at Darussalam School which was a private Islamic religious school in Narathiwat province and they had Melayu language as their mother tongue.
5. *Non-Muslim Students* referred to Non-Muslim students, excluding Muslim students, who studied at Narathiwat school which was a public school in Narathiwat province and they had Thai language as their mother tongue.
6. *Religious school* referred to a school that provides both general subject matter and religious subject matter to students.
7. *Public school* referred to a school that provides only general subject matter.
8. *High achievers* referred to 27% of students whose English score from Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET) was at the top ranking.
9. *Low achievers* referred to 27% of students whose English score from Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET) was at the bottom ranking.

## **2. Research Questions**

1. What kind of language learning strategies and personality traits do Muslim high and low achievers employ and have? Are there any significant differences between the two types of students?

2. What kind of language learning strategies and personality traits do non-Muslim high and low achievers employ and have? Are there any significant differences between the two types of students?
3. Are there any significant differences between Muslim high and low achievers and non-Muslim high and low achievers in their use of language learning strategies?
4. Are there any significant differences between Muslim high and low achievers and non-Muslim high and low achievers in their personality traits?

### **3. Literature Review and Related Studies**

#### **3.1 Language Learning Strategies**

##### **3.1.1 Definition of Language Learning Strategies**

Since the early 1970s, a growing research in the field of second language learning has increasingly shifted attention from investigating teachers and teaching to learners and learning (Wenden and Rubin, 1987). The phenomenon led many researches to discover individual differences that contribute to successful and unsuccessful language learners. Intensive exploration on the choice of language learning strategies use found that those students employed LLSs differently. The former group tended to focus on both form and meaning (Ellis, 1994) and used a wider range of LLSs, while the latter preferred strategies with less complication and employed a smaller range of LLSs.

The presentation of language learning strategies to the language field of study has led to the emerging of many definitions, which attempt to construct language learning strategies' meaning. For the definition, behavioral and cognitive aspects were widely referred to. Wenden and Rubin (1987) defined language learning strategies as “any set of operations, steps, plans, routines used by the learners to facilitate obtaining, storage, retrieval, and use of information ... to regulate their learning”, while O'malley and Chamot (1990), and Weinstein and Mayer (1986 cited in Macaro, 2001) describe LLS as thoughts and behaviors learners engage in to help them learn, and remember new information.

To give a clearer meaning of language learning strategies, Oxford (1990)'s interpretation is the most widely referred to. It is defined as “specific actions taken by the learners to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situation”. Hence, language learning strategy is emphasized as a special attack (Brown, 2000) taken and consoled by learners to make learning easier.

### 3.1.2 Classification of Language Learning Strategies

Numerous scholars attempted to categorize the aspect of language learning strategies. Their common categorization concerns the same issue-that is to ‘describe a good language learner’. Those classifications that are most widely cited are Rubin’s (1987), O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990), and Oxford’s (1990).

In Rubin’s (1987) work, three types of strategies were proposed: *learning strategies*, *communication strategies* and *social strategies*, whereas O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990) classification is based on drawing distinction between *cognitive*, *metacognitive*, and *socio-cognitive learning strategies*. However, not only LLS definition, Oxford’s classification is considered as the most compressive LLS taxonomy (Ellis, 1994). In Oxford (1990)’s language learning strategies organization, the learning strategies are divided into two categories and six sub-categories.

First, direct strategies “require mental processing of language” (Oxford, 1990:37) and consists of three types:

1. *Memory strategies* refer to using imaginary to store, retrieve information when needed to be used (e.g., grouping image and sound, reviewing )
2. *Cognitive strategies* refer to the ways of handling language, linking new information with the ones they already have (e.g., repeating, analyzing, and noting)
3. *Compensation strategies* refer to the ways to bridge the gap of language limitation (e.g., using gesture and mother tongue)

Second, indirect strategies provide “indirect support for language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety,

increasing cooperation and empathy, and other means” (Oxford, 1990:151). It consists of three types:

1. *Metacognitive strategies* refer to techniques employed to organize, plan, focus and evaluate learning (e.g., linking new and existing information, seeking for practice, and self-organizing )
2. *Affective strategies* refer to the ways emotions are handled (e.g., motivating, encouraging, and lowering anxiety)
3. *Social strategies* refer to strategies employed to take part in facilitating communication (e.g., asking questions, asking for clarification and cooperating with others)

However, only classification invented and proposed by Oxford (1990) were employed in the current study to categorize and identify students’ degree of use of specific strategies in facilitating their language learning.

### **3.2 Personality Traits**

Personality traits are in relation to characteristics, behaviors, attitudes, and feelings which distinguish one person from others. Thus to stereotype students in the same way might be irrelevant. For decades, personality traits are believed to be an important facet of contributing success among language learners (Ellis, 1994). Among those personalities, extroversion and introversion remain as essential dimensions of the traits (Wilt and Revelle, 2009).

Specifically, the introvert are referred to reservedness with tendency to be shy. In contrast, outgoing person, talkative, and confident characters are inferred as the extrovert. It is expected that the latter will outscore their counterpart in language learning. However, those understanding might be misleading. Brown (2000) proposed that the extrovert might contain stronger character. Extroversion needs ‘a sense of wholeness’ from others as opposed to introverts which already receive ‘a sense of wholeness’.

To investigate what types of personality students have displayed, various measurements are introduced to display the traits. Among those, “Myers-Briggs’ Type

indicator” (MBTI) is globally used and accepted (Brown, 2000; Ehrman, 2008). MBTI consists of four dimensions which will be described below:

***1) Extroversion and Introversion (E-I):***

The extrovert tend to let the people and things come in. They seem to be impulsive in making decision. In classroom setting, they are more comfortable with pair and group activities and normally seek for opportunities to get to know people in non-classroom situation. They are seen to be outgoing and have a large number of friends. In addition, they tend to be active to communicate through speaking more than writing.

The introvert are said to be very focused on inner world. They seem to be more interested and motivated when they work quietly without interruption. In classroom, they tend to keep quiet and most of the time they say no words. In making decision, they normally need time to process before reaching conclusion. They are understood to be a shy person.

***2) Sensing and Intuitive (S-I):***

In searching for information, the sensing tend to gain it through physical reality, seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, and smelling. They concern the most about the facts and explanation and like to remember details that seem to be important to them.

The intuitive tend to be drawn by abstract meaning, relationship, theoretical aspects, and possibilities about events. When remembering something, they are interested in memorizing them in bigger picture more than specific facts and details.

***3) Thinking and Feeling (T-F):***

The different characteristics of the thinking and feeling can be drawn on the situation when they have to make a decision. The

thinking tend to conclude their decision through the logical explanation, principles, and causes and effects. In classroom setting when they are with friends, they tend to avoid all conflicts even in a normal debate.

The feeling tend to make decision based on value. The involvement of others' opinion is important to them. In addition, they will do whatever to assure harmony between people.

#### ***4) Judging and Perceiving (J-P):***

The judging prefer to live in planned and systematic ways. They like to have things well-organized and settled. In learning, they prefer to have their exercise and homework done before going out to play with friends.

The perceiving tend to be more flexible. They invite new experience and information, and like to expose to them spontaneously without planning.

(Leaver, Ehrman, and Shekhtman, 2005).

The MBTI aimed to discover the four dichotomies, however; the current aim was only to investigate the extroversion and introversion pair of traits displayed by effective and less effective language learners as these two dimensions are closely linked to language acquisition. Thus, only the relevant questionnaire items from MBTI were used in this study.

### **3.3 Related Studies**

#### **3.3.1 Language Learning Strategies and Second Language Proficiency**

Extensive research concerning the choice of language learning strategies used by successful and unsuccessful language learners were conducted. Overall studies that will be reviewed in this section have a general consensus that the former group of

students uses a wider range of LLSs than the latter group, yet the different frequency and types of LLSs use were displayed:

Green and Oxford (1995) studied LLSs use of 374 EFL students at the University of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico. The significant relationship between Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) invented by Oxford (1990) and two variables –*L2 proficiency and gender*- were found. Cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, social strategies were used among high proficient learners, while females were reported of using strategies more frequently than males.

Wharton (2000) conducted a survey with 678 bilingual learners in Singapore, studying Japanese and French. SILL questionnaire was launched to seek the amount of strategies used by these learners. The findings (2000) showed that the high scale use of SILL was among high proficiency learners. Although the successful and unsuccessful learners tended to develop language competence through social and compensation strategies, differences in frequency use were revealed.

Employing the deep processing was revealed among the achievers in Gan et al., (2004)'s investigation. There were 18 students in the study, which were divided into two groups: 9 successful and 9 unsuccessful students from two Chinese universities. To elicit LLSs use by students, the researchers used multiple sorts of data such as interview, diaries and follow-up emails. They found that in vocabulary learning, unsuccessful peers only went through memorization technique to remember new words, while their counterparts made a sequence of steps to enhance their vocabulary learning. Not only they tried to remember but they tried to repeat reading. Getting global understanding, and highlighting the crucial parts were the strategies they also used.

Conducted with 480 participants from primary, secondary and tertiary level of education in Botswana to investigate the relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy belief, Magogwe and Oliver (2007) applied SILL questionnaire and the Morgan-Jinks Student Efficacy Scale (MJSES). It was found in the study that there were significant differences between effective and



less effective learners in strategies use. The higher proficiency students utilized strategies in language learning more than the less effective learners.

Conducted in China, Qingquan et al.'s work in 2008 aimed to measure the frequency use of language learning strategies by successful and unsuccessful students. To observe the strategies used by their 184 participants, SILL questionnaire was employed. The findings reveal that the successful students employ more frequently of language learning strategies compared to the unsuccessful peers. For direct strategies, the former tended to use more of *memory*, and *cognitive*, whereas the latter tended to employ more *compensation strategies*. In addition, the unsuccessful students used *metacognitive strategies* at a low rate, and seldom used *affective and social strategies* in their language learning.

To observe communication strategies among 176 participants having different proficiency levels and coming from various ethnic groups studying in Taiwan: East Asian, South Asian, European, and North American groups, Amy Fang-Yeh Hsieh (2014) used Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI). Due to the insufficiency of language competence, it was found that students with lower proficiency level only participated in what they thought they know well, and used strategies that related to avoidance and reduction more than the higher proficient ones.

With regard to LLS used by Muslim students, extensive studies were conducted in Arabian context. For example, Khalil (2005) used Oxford's (1990) SILL to examine the impact of language proficiency level and gender on language learning strategies use among 194 Palestinian high school and 184 university students. The findings revealed that the latter group employed higher frequency of strategy use than the former group. Within their own group, high school and university students were reported as the high frequent users of metacognitive strategies, which were related to organizing, planning, and evaluating, while memory and affective strategies were the least used of the overall strategies among both high school and university students respectively. In addition, female students surpass male students in the frequency use of LLSs.

In Iranian context, Gerami and Baighlou (2011) explored the language learning strategies that were used by 200 successful and unsuccessful students, majoring in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) and English Translation using SILL. The result of the study revealed that the successful students used a wider range of LLSs compared to their counterparts, from which metacognitive and compensation strategies were the most preferred strategies among them. They did not employ much of social, memory and affective strategies to facilitate their learning. For their counterparts, the unsuccessful students were reported that they preferred to use cognitive, compensation, and memory strategies to aid their learning, while metacognitive, social, and affective strategies were less concerned by them.

Using SILL questionnaire to elicit 701 Arabian students studying English in Ha'io University, Alhaisoni (2012) found that students used strategies between low and moderate level of frequency. Cognitive and metacognitive appeared among top strategies, while affective and memory strategies were among the least used strategies. Furthermore, it was consistent with those previous researches that students with high proficiency have more awareness in employing LLSs than their counterpart.

In Thailand, since learner-centered approach is promoted, students' language learning strategies were observed in many studies. For example, the successful students fell into the high use of overall Oxford's SILL, as reported in Saiyarin (2011)'s study of the 156 freshmen at Prince of Songkla University. The successful ones were more frequent in 'trying to look for different ways to enhance English proficiency' and in low use of affective strategies. The unsuccessful fell in the high use of metacognitive and low use of memory strategies.

The relationship between variables-*motivation, the length of exposure to English and gender*-and language learning strategies were mentioned in Khamkhien's study (2010). The participants were 84 Thai and 52 Vietnamese students studying in two public universities in two countries. Using SILL questionnaire to observe the strategy use, the study concluded that those with a low motivation and less exposure to English tended to employ small range of strategies. In addition, Vietnamese males and females used more overall strategies than Thai subjects.

Indeed, it can be interpreted from the above previous studies that the high achievement students employ more frequently in using various language learning strategies. However, the differences are drawn in the specific use of language learning strategies and it is hypothesized that the context diversity affects the choice of language learning strategies use (Ellis, 1994; Saville-Troike, 2006).

### **3.3.2 Introversion/ Extroversion and Second language Proficiency**

Individual learners' characteristics specifically extroversion and introversion personality traits are believed to influence students' language learning (Brown, 2000). Extroversion is generally understood as outgoingness, and introversion is reservedness. To investigate if both traits have an impact on language learning, many studies were conducted as briefed in the following review.

Chastain (1975 cited in Busch, 1982) carried out a research to investigate the relationship between the personality traits of college students at the beginning level of learning language and their success in language learning. The finding found positive correlation that the outgoing students seemed to be successful in language learning. The result was consistent with Tucker, Hamayan and Genesee's study (1976 cited in Busch, 1982) which hypothesized that the more outgoing students displayed, the better they did in listening and oral examination.

In 2008, Gan studied oral capabilities of a group of extrovert students being videotaped at different occasions. Forty tapes were analyzed. The study employed various assessments: in-depth analysis of the discourse and Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ). The study revealed that students with the degree of extroversion displayed active behavior and participated in oral communication with high level of accuracy and fluency.

Using Eysenck Personality Profiler (EPP), and Employee Aptitude Survey (EAS), self-report inventory assessments, Chamorro-Premuzic, Furnham and Petrides (2006) observed the relationship between personality dimensions and verbal and numerical ability of 118 participants. They concluded that the link between

participants displaying extroversion dimension of personality and verbal ability was found.

Ockey (2011) observed personality of 360 first year university students studying English with Japanese version of NEO-PI-R and assessed their oral abilities with oral discussions test. It was reported that assertiveness gave students advantages in producing oral communication.

However, the different results contradictory to the above studies were also found as follows. In Japan. Busch (1982) launched a study to investigate the correlation between introversion/extroversion personalities and the proficiency level of 185 Japanese students. The study used Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) and oral interview to assess personality traits and conducted a test to assess their proficiency level. It was reported that although male participants exhibited higher degree of extroversion personality trait, they gained lower average score on the test compared to females' counterpart. In addition, it was revealed in the study that the introvert were better at pronunciation. The similar result was found in 1996 study conducted by Carrell, Prince, and Astika (1996) with 76 Indonesian students. MBTI was used to investigate students' personality. The findings showed that the introvert learners had outscored extrovert learners in all the four skills they studied: reading, grammar, vocabulary, and writing.

Conducted with 150 Mexico, Marin-Marin (2005) found no relation between extroverted personality and vocabulary learning strategies, but found that the introvert gained higher grades in English compared to the extrovert.

Likewise, Ehrman (2008) applied Myer Brigg Type Indicator (MBTI), in her study aiming to find the personality types among the effective language learners and found that learners with a degree of being the introvert were good learners of foreign language learning.

In addition, in his observation in Chinese classroom study (unstated number of students), Wong (2011) found that although the students with extroversion type of personality always and normally initiated communication more than their counterpart,

they seemed to produce language with less accuracy. However, the introvert took time to rearrange sentences and produce language with more grammatical accuracy.

Indicated by the above studies concerning extroversion/introversion personality traits and the level of language proficiency, they show inconsistent results. Therefore, it could not be said based on the assumption made by many studies that the extroversion type is better in second language learning (Busch, 1982; Wong, 2011). In addition, it was hypothesized that the context and culture where students lived might play a significant role (Ellis, 1994). The personality traits of Muslim students were found in the study concerning English LLSs use and attitude towards English language learning. They were reported that most of them preferred introversion type, especially in female students due to a limitation to socialize with people (El-Dib, 2004) and religion demanding. Yet the result in English language study is inconsistent, either extroversion or introversion subsequently gain high score in the test.

This study should be conducted with the aim to compare the extroversion/introversion personality traits among Muslim and non-Muslim students, whether the high and low achiever of these two groups show the personality traits in different ways. In addition, the study will be replicated due to the scarcity of extroversion/introversion research in the EFL context (Carrell et al., 1996) where the study aims to conduct and for more consistent information.

#### **4. The significance of the study**

1. The result of the current study is expected to provide:

- A possible language learning strategies taken into action by Muslim and Non-Muslim students in six categories; *memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective, and social strategies*.
- A scenario of learners' personality trait in learning English in two dimensions; *extroversion and introversion*.

2. The findings of the research are expected to reveal student's personality traits and their learning strategies employed to facilitate language learning. They can be

taken as a guideline to increase teachers' awareness and understanding in organizing/conducting teaching which will be the most appropriate for students with different ethnical and language proficiency background.

## **5. Methodology**

### **5.1 Participants**

The study employed purposive sampling to include sample group whose characteristic match with the target group that the current study aimed to observe. Two large-sized schools were chosen based on students characteristic: Darussalam school representing Muslim students whose language background is Melayu; Narathiwat school representing non-Muslim students whose language background is Thai.

The population of Matthayomsuksa 4 students in 2014 academic year in both schools included 733 Muslim students and 189 non-Muslim students. However, not all those students participated in this study. The participants were divided into high and low achievement students based on Hughes (1989)'s 27% techniques; those students with English score in O-NET (Ordinary National Educational Test: English conversation, reading comprehension, grammar, and vocabulary) at 27% top and 27% bottom respectively. As a result, there were 213 high and 106 low Muslim achievers and 68 high and 60 low non-Muslim achievers.

### **5.2 Instrumentations**

The study employed three instruments, two questionnaires and one interview: 1) *the Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL)* (see Appendix A), 2) *Mayer-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)*(see Appendix B ), and 3) *group interview*(see Appendix C).

#### **5.2.1 The Questionnaires**

To observe language learning strategies and extroversion and introversion personality dimensions, the current study employed two questionnaires: 1) Strategy

Inventory of Language Learning and 2) Myer-Brigg Type Inventory. The details are as follows.

*1. Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL)*

The present study employed Oxford's Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) Version 7.0 (Oxford, 1990) which is designed to measure the frequency of language learning strategies used by the speakers of other languages. The SILL is a self-scoring questionnaire. It consists of 50 items attempting to determine two categories and six sub-categories of learning strategies. Some examples are "*I preview the lesson before and after study*", and "*I seek for opportunities to speak English with native and non-native speakers*".

The SILL was selected for this study because it is considered as the most widely used instrument (Riazi, 2007) for accessing students' learning strategies and has been reported of gaining high validity and reliability in many studies (Oxford and Ehrman, 1995; Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995). Table 1 shows 2 main categories and 6 sub-categories of language learning strategies. Table 2 list Oxford's (1990) inventory of language learning strategies.

The SILL questionnaire was modified and translated into Thai language before submitting to three language experts to examine its content validity based on IOC or Index of Item-Objective Congruence (Rovinelli and Hambleton, 1977), which the result met the satisfactory line with 1.0 of IOC. Then the questionnaire was tried out to test its reliability with 40 students (10 Muslim high achievers, 10 Muslim low achievers 10 non-Muslim high achievers and 10 non-Muslim low achievers) which later gained the Cronbach's Alpha at 0.94 which can be considered as a high degree (Dörnyei and Taguchi, 2009; Oxford and Ehrman, 1995). (Appendix D shows the Thai language version of SILL)

**Table 1:** Type of language learning strategies

<b>Direct Strategies</b>	Memory Strategies
	Cognitive Strategies
	Compensation Strategies
<b>Indirect Strategies</b>	Metacognitive Strategies
	Affective Strategies

---



---

 Social Strategies
 

---



---

**Table 2:** List of language learning strategies items invented by Oxford (1990)

Language Learning Strategy	
Memory	1 I think of relationships between what I already know and new things that I learn in English.
	2 I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.
	3 I connect the sound of a new English word and a picture of the word to help me remember the word.
	4 I remember a new English word by imagining a situation in which the word might be used.
	5 I use similar sounds to remember new English word. For example, “believe” and “receive” have the same sound, so I put them in the same group
	6 I use flashcards to remember new English words.
	7 I physically act out new English words.
	8 I review English lessons often.
	9 I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location, for example, on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.
Cognitive	10 I say or write new English words many times.
	11 I try to talk like native English speakers.
	12 I practice the sounds of English.
	13 I use the English words I know in different ways.
	14 I start conversations in English.
	15 I watch movies with English soundtrack.
	16 I read for pleasure in English.
	17 I write notes in English.
	18 I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully again.
	19 I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
	20 I study English sentences structure in order to get the language patterns to be used later.
	21 I find the meaning of English words by dividing it into parts that I can understand.
	22 I try not to translate word-for-word.
	23 I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.
Compensation	24 To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.
	25 When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gesture.
	26 I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.
	27 I read English without looking up every new word.
	28 I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.
	29 If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.



Metacognitive	30	I try to find chances that I can to use English.
	31	I notice my English mistakes and use it to help me do better.
	32	I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
	33	I try to find out how to be a better leaner of English.
	34	I organize my timetable so I will have enough time to study English.
	35	I look for people I can talk to in English.
	36	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
	37	I have clear goals for improving my English skills, for example, listening and speaking skills.
	38	I think about my progress in learning English.
Affective	39	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
	40	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.
	41	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.
	42	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.
	43	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.
	44	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.
Social	45	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.
	46	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.
	47	I practice English with other students.
	48	I ask for help from English speakers.
	49	I ask questions in English.
	50	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

## 2. Myer-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

Myer-Briggs type indicator (MBTI) was used to investigate personality traits. The design of the MBTI model is based on Carl Jung's theory of psychological type (Brown, 2000). MBTI consists of four pairs of personality dimensions including: *extroversion – introversion*, *intuition – sensing*, *thinking – feeling*, and *judging – perceiving*. The MBTI was selected in this current study because of the claim that it is one of the most widely used instrument to determine personality traits (Carrell et al., 1996; Leaver et al., 2005), and its high validity in various cultural context such as in Latin America and Asian countries are mentioned (Kirby and Barger 1998 cited in Nikoopour and Farsani 2010). However, the scope of this study was only on the observation of extroversion and introversion. Therefore, only 11 items relevant to the purpose were translated in Thai.

The validity of the Thai translated version of MBTI questionnaire was examined by three language experts based on the criteria in IOC or Index of Item-Objective Congruence (Rovinelli and Hambleton, 1977), and gained the satisfactory result with 1.0 of IOC. Then the questionnaire was tried out to check the reliability with 40 students: 10 Muslim high achievers, 10 Muslim low achievers 10 non-Muslim high achievers and 10 non-Muslim low achievers. Table 3 and 4 show the MBTI taxonomy and the 11 items related to extroversion and introversion personality traits respectively. (Appendix E includes the Thai version of MBTI)

**Table 3:**Myer-Briggs Personality Traits taxonomy

<b>MBTI Personality Traits</b>	
<b>Extroversion</b>	<b>Introversion</b>
<b>Intuition</b>	<b>Sensing</b>
<b>Thinking</b>	<b>Feeling</b>
<b>Judging</b>	<b>Perceiving</b>

**Table 4:** List of extroversion and introversion personality traits items

---

1. Are you usually a “good mixer”, or rather quiet and reserved?
2. Among your friends are you <i>full of news about everybody</i> , or <i>one of the last to hear what is going on</i> ?
3. Do you tend to have <i>broad friendships with many different people</i> , or <i>deep friendship with very few people</i> ?
4. When you are with the group of people, would you usually rather <i>join in the talk of the group</i> , or <i>imaginative people</i> ?
5. Do you <i>talk easily to almost anyone for as long as you have to</i> , or <i>find a lot to say only to certain people or under certain conditions</i> ?
6. In a large group, do you more often <i>introduce others</i> , or <i>get introduced</i> ?
7. Can the new people you meet tell what you are interested in <i>right away</i> , or <i>only after they really get to know you</i> ?
8. Do you usually <i>show your feelings freely</i> , or <i>keep your feelings to yourself</i> ?
Are you...
9. Quiet or hearty
10. Reserved or talkative
11. Calm or lively

---

### 5.2.2The guided interview

The interview was performed in the current study to investigate in depth on language leaning strategies and extroversion/introversion personality traits. A guided

interview form consisting of questions related to their language learning strategies and personality traits were constructed. 19 questions related to LLSs and personality traits were translated to Thai language. Examples of questions were “*Do you like to practice English with others or on your own? Why?*”, “*What do you do if you get stressed when studying English?*”, and “*Do you always express your opinion among your close friends or a group of people?*” (Appendix F shows the Thai version of the interview items)

The validity of the guided interview items were scrutinized by three language experts according to the criteria invented in IOC or Index of Item-Objective Congruence (Rovinelli and Hambleton, 1976), and received 1.0 of IOC. Before using with the participants, the items were tried out to check the clarity with 20 students: 5 Muslim high achievers, 5 Muslim low achievers, 5 non-Muslim high achievers, and 5 non-Muslim low achievers. It was found that the students understand the questions and could respond with relevant information. These items were to be used with 40 participants of this study.

### **5.3 Data Collection**

#### **5.3.1 The questionnaires**

With the students’ supervisors, the researcher arranged to meet the target students at Naratiwat school in English class periods. The researcher explained the purpose of the study, and also gave the directions of how the two questionnaires should be completed. Students were asked to respond honestly to all the items. Throughout the one-hour session, students were allowed to raise their hands and asked questions if they found any difficulties. With their supervisors, the researcher checked the completeness when the students handed in their questionnaires to ensure that the returned questionnaires were complete, and the same procedures were applied with students in Darussalam school. Due to the time constraints, the researcher had to visit Darussalam school twice and some students had other commitment during the second visit causing the lower number of the personality traits questionnaires.

Indicated in Table 5 below is the amount of sample size and the returned questionnaire.

**Table 5:** The number of participants in this study

Students	Target sample size	Number of returned LLSs questionnaire	%	Number of returned personality traits questionnaire	%
<b>Muslim High</b>	213	209	98%	167	78%
<b>Muslim Low</b>	106	101	95%	101	95%
<b>Non-Muslim High</b>	68	59	86%	59	86%
<b>Non-Muslim Low</b>	60	55	91%	55	91%

### 5.3.2 The guided interview

At each school, after the questionnaires were completed, 10 high achievers and 10 low achievers were asked to participate in the group interviews on voluntary basis. The four groups were: 10 Muslim high achievers, 10 Muslim low achievers, 10 non-Muslim high achievers, and 10 non-Muslim low achievers. Each group was asked in Thai language about their English language learning strategies and personality traits which were comprised of 19 questions. Throughout the interview, each question was not asked specifically to anyone. It meant that after one student responded, others were encouraged to add up more information and freely expressed their own opinions. Each interview took approximately between 20-30 minutes. The researcher also recorded the interview.

### 5.4 Data Analysis

To analyze data from the questionnaires, the study used descriptive analysis as the statistical devices to calculate Mean, Standard Deviation and Independent t-test to indicate whether there were any significant differences among participants of both groups in employing strategies and displaying personality traits while the data from interview were categorized and summarized.

Based on Oxford (1990) these following intervals were employed to interpret the mean score in LLSs questionnaire:

The mean score 1.00-1.49 means the least frequently used

The mean score 1.50-2.49 means rarely used

The mean score 2.50-3.49 means moderately used

The mean score 3.50-4.49 means frequently used

The mean score 4.50-.5.00 means the most frequently used

To interpret extroversion and introversion in the personality traits questionnaire, the study adapted these following intervals from Quenk (2006)'s dichotomy:

The mean score 0.01 - 2.75 means slight E-I personality

The mean score 2.76 - 5.50 means moderate E-I personality

The mean score 5.51 - 8.25 means clear E-I personality

The mean score 8.26 - 11.00 means very clear E-I personality

In addition, the data from the interview sessions were interpreted qualitatively in a way to support the quantitative data from the questionnaires.

## 6. Results

**Research Question 1:** What kind of language learning strategies and personality traits do Muslim high and low achievers employ and have? Are there any significant differences between the two types of students?

### 6.1 Strategies used and personality displayed by Muslim high and low achievers

It was indicated in Table 6 that all students fell only into moderate level of overall strategies users. Nevertheless, Muslim high achievers were found using them more significantly (HMx=3.03, LMx=2.77). For direct and indirect strategies, all Muslim students fell into moderate use range of both strategies types. Both groups reported of using indirect strategies (*strategies helping students learn language in indirect way unrelated to the content e.g. monitoring their own studies*) more often than direct strategies (*strategies which contribute directly to language learning-deep*

*processing e.g. memorizing new vocabularies*). As indicated, the high achievement students significantly outpaced their counterparts in frequency use of both strategies.

Students were found using metacognitive (HMx=3.46, LMx=3.13) and affective strategies more than other strategies (*e.g. finding out how to be a better learner of English and attempting to speak English in spite of being afraid of making mistakes*). However, the Muslim high performers used them more significantly.

Cognitive strategies (HMx=2.97, LMx=2.66) were reported among top strategies used by the high and low scorers respectively (*e.g. using an English word in different ways and reviewing English lessons*). Consistently with the data in the interview, compensation strategies (*e.g. using gestures*) were ranked among lowest strategies used by Muslim students in both groups (HMx=2.93, LMx=2.66). Both used these strategies moderately; however, it was again employed more significantly by the high scorers. Only social and memory strategies were used at similar degree.

Memory strategies, for example: using flash cards, reviewing English lessons before and after classes, memorizing new English vocabularies and sentences were reported in the opened-ended questions and interviews of frequently used by both groups of these Muslim students. Most of the interviewed students mentioned that memory strategies were easy to apply.. In addition, listening to English music, watching soundtrack movies and English videos from Youtube were among the most interesting activities perceived by Muslim learners

**Table 6:** Language learning strategies used by Muslim high and low achievers

Language Learning Strategies		H-Muslim (n=209)		L-Muslim (n=101)		t	sig(2-tailed)
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Direct</b>	2.93	0.66	2.69	0.58	3.11	0.00
	<b>Indirect</b>	3.15	0.76	2.89	0.58	3.16	0.00
<b>Direct</b>	Memory	2.88	0.70	2.73	0.60	1.80	0.07
	Cognitive	2.97	0.71	2.66	0.64	3.48	0.00
	Compensation	2.93	0.72	2.66	0.63	3.09	0.00
<b>Indirect</b>	Metacognitive	3.46	0.87	3.13	0.68	3.43	0.00
	Affective	3.07	0.75	2.77	0.65	3.27	0.00
	Social	2.78	0.86	2.66	0.74	1.25	0.21
<b>TOTAL</b>		3.03	0.68	2.77	0.54	3.37	0.00

Regarding personality traits illustrated in Table 7, it was found that Muslim high and low achievers fell into significantly different dichotomy of personality traits dimensions ( $P < 0.02$ ). Muslim high scorers reported of being clear introversion (HMx=6.90, S.D.=3.22) even though they also fell into moderate extroversion type of personality (HMx=4.10, S.D.=3.22), while their counterparts fell into clear opposite side of personality dimension-being clear extrovert (LMx=7.07, S.D.=4.00) and moderate introvert (LMx=3.93, S.D.=4.00).

**Table 7:** Personality traits of Muslim high and low achievers

Personality Traits	H-Muslim		L-Muslim		t	sig (2-tailed)
	(n=167)		(n=101)			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
EXTRO	4.10	3.22	7.07	4.00	6.32	0.00
INTRO	6.90	3.22	3.93	4.00	-6.32	0.00

**Research Question 2:** What kind of the language learning strategies and personality traits do non-Muslim high and low achievers employ and have? Are there any significant differences between the two types of students?

## 6.2 Strategies used and personality traits displayed by non-Muslim high and low achiever

Illustrated in Table 8, non-Muslim students reported of using overall strategies moderately, but the high scorers used it more significantly. Indirect strategies were employed by them more than direct strategies, yet again; they were used significantly more by the high scorers. Moreover, there were only three strategies reported of significantly used by the high scorers: metacognitive, social and cognitive strategies (*e.g. paying attention when someone speaks English, asking questions in English and reading for pleasure*) ( $P < 0.02$ ). Every specific strategy fell into moderately used, except cognitive strategies used by the low scorers that fell into rarely use range.

Student seemed to value metacognitive strategies, because it is appeared to be the top strategies used by non-Muslim students (*e.g. paying attention to someone speaking English*), but the high scorers employed it more significantly (HNMX = 3.27, LNMX = 2.72).

Cognitive and social were found among top strategies used significantly more by high non-Muslim scorers even though these strategies fell into only moderate use range. However, the low scorers were not much likely to apply both strategies. The top strategies among low non-Muslim scorers were memory and affective strategies even though they were used moderately.

Activities non-Muslim students reported with high degree of action to help them learn English were surfing the Internet to read current news in simple English regarding gadgets, sports and movie stars; accessing English videos on Youtube to learn English; listening to English songs; and spending leisure time watching soundtrack movies.

**Table 8:** Language learning strategies used by non-Muslim high and low achievers

Language Learning Strategies		H-nonMuslim		L-nonMuslim		t	sig (2-tailed)
		(n=59)		(n=55)			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Direct</b>	2.92	0.45	2.52	0.42	4.87	0.00
	<b>Indirect</b>	3.05	0.59	2.63	0.57	3.87	0.00
<b>Direct</b>	Memory	2.64	0.53	2.66	0.56	0.16	0.88
	Cognitive	3.17	0.65	2.41	0.56	6.64	0.00
	Compensation	2.75	0.74	2.56	0.56	1.54	0.13
<b>Indirect</b>	Metacognitive	3.27	0.82	2.72	0.72	3.85	0.00
	Affective	2.77	0.66	2.59	0.65	1.47	0.14
	Social	3.01	0.71	2.55	0.70	3.47	0.00
<b>Total</b>		2.97	0.46	2.57	0.41	4.99	0.00

For personality traits among non-Muslim high and low achievers, it was stated in Table 9 that although non-Muslim high and low scorers fell into extroversion category (HNM $\bar{x}$ =7.00, S.D.=2.68; LNM $\bar{x}$ =8.4, S.D.=2.60), the lower proficiency students were significantly more extrovert. Furthermore, high performers perceived themselves as moderate introversion students (HNM $\bar{x}$ =4.00, S.D.=2.68) and only slight introversion (LNM $\bar{x}$ =2.51, S.D.=2.60) for the lower proficiency students.



This was consistent with results from the interview that the answers in the interview sessions were normally initiated by the lower proficiency students. The assertiveness and readiness to answer was clearer, while the high performers needed time to rearrange the answers before eventually responded.

**Table 9:** Personality traits of non-Muslim high and low achievers

Personality Traits	H- nonMuslim (n=59)		L- nonMuslim (n=55)		t	sig (2-tailed)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
	EXTRO	7.00	2.68	8.49		
INTRO	4.00	2.68	2.51	2.60	-3.01	0.00

**Research Question 3:** Are there any significant differences between Muslim high and low achievers and non-Muslim high and low achievers in their use of language learning strategies?

### 6.3 Comparison of strategies used between Muslim high achievers and non-Muslim high achievers

As shown in Table 10, top scorers of both ethnicities similarly used indirect strategies more than direct strategies. In addition, there are no significant differences between the two groups regarding the frequency in using neither direct nor indirect strategies. However, only memory and affective strategies were used more significantly by Muslim high scorers.

High score learners tended to utilize metacognitive strategies more frequently than other strategies (*e.g. paying attention to someone speaking English*). Nevertheless, both Muslim and non-Muslim high scorers fell into moderate user of this strategy ( $HMx = 3.46$ ,  $HNMx = 3.27$ ). To further compare, other strategies found moderately used in both groups also produced no statistically significant differences except for memory and affective strategies. Each of these was used more by the Muslim high performers than the non-Muslim high performers.

Apart from metacognitive and cognitive strategies (*e.g. finding out how to be a good English learner and practicing the sound of English*), affective and social strategies (*e.g. trying to relax to overcome fear of using English and asking people to repeat or slow down if they do not understand*) appeared among the top strategies used by Muslim and non-Muslim high scorers. Furthermore, compensation and memory strategies were found to be among the least used strategies (*e.g. acting out to remember words and making up new words*) by high score learners.

**Table 10:** Language learning strategies used by Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers

Language Learning Strategies		H-Muslim		H-nonMuslim		t	sig (2-tailed)
		(n=209)		(n=59)			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Direct</b>	2.93	0.66	2.92	0.45	0.19	0.85
	<b>Indirect</b>	3.15	0.76	3.05	0.59	1.03	0.31
<b>Direct</b>	Memory	2.88	0.70	2.64	0.53	2.74	0.01
	Cognitive	2.97	0.71	3.17	0.65	1.91	0.06
	Compensation	2.93	0.72	2.75	0.74	1.66	0.10
<b>Indirect</b>	Metacognitive	3.46	0.87	3.27	0.82	1.42	0.16
	Affective	3.07	0.75	2.77	0.66	2.71	0.01
	Social	2.78	0.86	3.01	0.71	1.83	0.07
<b>Total</b>		3.30	0.68	2.97	0.46	0.63	0.53

#### 6.4 Comparison of strategies used between Muslim low achievers and non-Muslim low achievers

As previously illustrated, Muslim and non-Muslim low scorers were known using overall strategies lower than the high scorers. Yet, both Muslim and non-Muslim low scorers fell into moderate use range (LMx=2.77, LNMx=2.57); however, the former group used them more significantly (Table 11).

It was also reported that both low scorers tended to use indirect strategies rather than applying direct strategies. Nevertheless, the Muslim low scorers used indirect strategies more significantly. For each specific strategy, only cognitive strategies used by non-Muslim fell into rarely used, whereas other strategies were used in moderate range of frequency.

To learn English language, both groups mutually prioritized metacognitive, affective and memory strategies over the others (*e.g. finding out a better way to be a good English learner, remembering new words by imagining situation they can be used, and overcoming the fear when using English*). However, only metacognitive and cognitive strategies were reported to be used significantly differently between the two groups ( $P < 0.02$ ).

**Table 11:** Language learning strategies used by Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers

Language Learning Strategies		L-Muslim		L-nonMuslim		t	sig (2-tailed)
		(n=101)		(n=55)			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Direct</b>	2.69	0.58	2.52	0.42	1.89	0.06
	<b>Indirect</b>	2.89	0.58	2.63	0.57	2.71	0.01
<b>Direct</b>	Memory	2.73	0.60	2.66	0.56	0.75	0.45
	Cognitive	2.66	0.64	2.41	0.56	2.46	0.02
	Compensation	2.66	0.63	2.56	0.56	1.05	0.30
<b>Indirect</b>	Metacognitive	3.13	0.68	2.72	0.72	3.60	0.00
	Affective	2.77	0.65	2.59	0.65	1.69	0.09
	Social	2.66	0.74	2.55	0.70	0.88	0.38
<b>Total</b>		2.77	0.54	2.57	0.41	2.49	0.01

**Research Question 4:** Are there any significant differences between Muslim high and low achievers and non-Muslim high and low achievers in their personality traits?

#### 6.5 Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers

As indicated in Table 12, it can be seen that Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers reflected different dimensions of being extrovert and introvert. Their

personality traits are significantly different ( $P < 0.02$ ) which can be said to be opposite. Muslim high performers saw themselves as clear introvert ( $HMx=6.90$ ,  $S.D.=3.22$ ) whereas the non-Muslim high performers considered themselves clear extrovert ( $HNmx=7.00$ ,  $S.D.=2.68$ ). However, the Muslim high performers are also seen as moderate extrovert while the non-Muslim reflected their behaviors as the moderate introvert.

In addition, the data derived from the questionnaire were consistent with the interview data. Most of Muslim students claimed introversion side of personality, whereas half of non-Muslim students preferred extroversion.

**Table 12:** Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers

Personality Traits	H-				t	sig (2-tailed)
	H-Muslim (n=167)		nonMuslim (n=59)			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
EXTRO	4.10	3.22	7.00	2.68	-6.75	0.00
INTRO	6.90	3.22	4.00	2.68	6.75	0.00

#### 6.6 Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers

As far as the personalities among low performers were compared, it was found that they mutually fell into clear and very clear extroversion range of personality ( $LMx=7.07$ ,  $S.D.=4.00$ ;  $LNmx=8.49$ ,  $S.D.=2.60$ ). However, non-Muslim low achievers showed clearer picture of being extrovert learners as indicated by the degree of a significant difference in Table 13. The comparison further illustrated a moderate degree of being introvert among Muslim low performers and a slight degree of that trait among the non-Muslim low performers.

**Table 13:** Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers

Personality Trait	L-		t	sig (2-tailed)
	L-Muslim (n=101)	NonMuslim (n=55)		

	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
EXTRO	7.07	4.00	<b>8.49</b>	2.60	-2.68	0.01
INTRO	<b>3.93</b>	4.00	2.51	2.60	2.68	0.01

## 7. Summary of the findings

Table 14 illustrates the main findings of this current study. With reference to the research questions of the study, the findings can be summarized as follows:

Regarding strategies use, Muslim and non-Muslim participants in the study employed overall strategies moderately. When looking deeper into specific strategies, all participants were keen on using metacognitive more than others and cognitive received less attention from these participants. Memory strategies were popularly used among Muslim students, while social strategies remained the least used. Furthermore, Non-Muslim students appeared to use social strategies more than Muslim students.

Related to personality dimensions, only Muslim high achievers were found displaying more introversion than extroversion, while the others were likely to fall into extroversion dimension of personality traits.

**Table 14:** Summary of the findings

	<b>Language learning Strategies (Top use to the least use strategies)</b>	<b>Frequency of each strategies</b>	<b>Frequency of overall strategies use</b>	<b>Personality traits Dimensions</b>
<b>Muslim High achievers</b>	Metacognitive Affective Cognitive Compensation Memory Social	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate extroversion- clear introversion
<b>Muslim Low achievers</b>	Metacognitive Affective Memory Compensation Cognitive social	Moderate	Moderate	Clear extroversion- moderate introversion
<b>Non-Mulsim High achievers</b>	Metacognitive Cognitive Social Affective Compensation Memory	Moderate	Moderate	Clear extroversion- moderate introversion
<b>Non-Muslim Low achievers</b>	Metacognitive Memory Affective Compensation Social Cognitive	Moderate     rarely	Moderate	Very clear extroversion- slight introversion

## 8. Discussion of the findings

### 8.1 Language learning strategies used among Muslim and non-Muslim students

#### 8.1.1 Strategies used by Muslim high and low achievers

The result revealed that the high scorers group utilized overall strategies significantly more often than another group. It can be implied that the more strategies they tend to employ to facilitate in language learning, the more awareness they showed. To be specific, direct and indirect strategies were reported of high frequency used among high scorers. This result is consistent with many prominent studies. For

example, in 1975, with intention to investigate how good language learners learn the language, Rubin found that successful students utilized a wide range of strategies in language learning. Grainger (1997) found different strategies used by different ethnicities or different language background. While learners with Asian background tended to guess meaning, those with European and English-speaking background prioritized in using dictionaries and scheduling language learning. Qingquan et al. (2008) investigated language learning strategies among the first year Chinese students in a university in China and found that successful learners employed strategies more often than the unsuccessful ones.

Muslim students were found applying similar and different strategies at different level of frequency. Metacognitive and affective strategies appear to be popular among these two groups of learners. Both strategies are classified as indirect strategies related to managing, evaluating, monitoring, and dealing with emotion. The frequency use of strategies among Muslim students indicated that students are aware of strategies in promoting language understanding indirectly-not only through learning routes like memorizing, creating structure, or guessing intelligently but also paying attention to English speaking, finding ways to improve competencies, and looking for opportunity to use English.

Social strategies are found the least used strategies among these students, although they were in moderate use range. It could be implied with the limitation of interaction with those whose English is a medium of conversation. Based on the interview, students were afraid of speaking English with their friends fearing that their friends might laugh or make fun of them if they made mistakes. This aroused students in turning to use affective strategy to produce motivation in speaking English. In addition, claimed by a study conducted in Kuwait (El-Dib, 2004) concerning Islamic context in which gender sensitivity plays an important role in society, females have more limited opportunity than males to socialize with others due to religious demanding. However, to propose in the view of educational framework, based on students' context in the current study, it might be implied with the lack of opportunities to practice social strategies outside the classroom setting. Social strategies require spoken language, for example, asking for more information, help,

and clarification. To socialize with people in English outside the classroom seems to be limited for these students to practice.

#### 8.1.2 Strategies used by non-Muslim high and low achievers

Equally to those Muslim students, these non-Muslim students have employed metacognitive strategies more than other strategies. However, the important factor that contributes to the different outcome of the study might be explained by the frequency or the density of applying this strategy, which high performance students used metacognitive in a greater amount of frequency.

Being proficient, the non-Muslim high scorers might not have to rely much on memorizing and remembering compared with their counterparts. For example, to recognize the word “unhelpful”, the high scorers might have only a first glance and know what it means by using their high cognitive strategies to break it into prefix ‘un’, ‘help’, and suffix ‘ful’, but for the low cognitive strategies students, remembering left only a choice.

The high scorers use social more than affective, while the low scorers use affective more than social strategies. Since having more proficiency in language learning, it helps the high scorers to be able to apply more social strategies when encountering even unexpected situations, while the low scorers have to overcome the fear of producing mistakes and they need to ponder of compensation strategies.

#### 8.1.3 Similarities and differences in employing English language learning strategies among Muslim and non-Muslim high and low achievers

It is evident in the current study that learners from different ethnicities produced different strategies in English learning. High performance learners have employed more frequently language learning strategies to facilitate their language learning. This result is consistent with many studies, for example, Griffiths (2003) and Hong-nam and Leavell (2006) who found that the more advanced the proficiency of the students, the more strategies they tend to utilize in language learning. This indicates that students are aware and make the most of LLS that can contribute to their language learning in indirect ways.



All the participants in this study were reported adopting and prioritizing metacognitive strategies in developing their language learning ranging from finding opportunities to use English, noticing mistakes to prove them better, organizing and scheduling timetable for practicing, monitoring their own language learning development, and evaluating language learning process (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990).

The importance of metacognitive was emphasized as O'Malley and Chamot (1990) put it, "students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without direction or opportunity to plan their learning, monitor their progress, or review their accomplishments and future learning directions". Similarly, Anderson (2008) confirmed that metacognitive is "the ability to make one's thinking visible", and it required the engagement of cognitive ability to achieve specific tasks and goals.

The utilization of metacognitive strategies showed the awareness of students towards managing English language learning. The mutual result is consistent with the study conducted by Saiyarin (2011). She found that student initially utilized metacognitive strategies. With a requirement to accomplish their English tasks, metacognitive indirectly led students to involve in language progress at the beginning stage starting from planning to evaluating, and in other ways, these strategies could promote self-autonomous and self-regulations in learning. Metacognitive strategies may be less perplexed to students' perceptions as it could individually be applied inside and outside classroom context so it might be another assumption to propose why most of students employed this strategy at high level of frequency compared with others strategies.

In addition, both groups of low performers were similarly found that they hardly applied cognitive strategies in language learning. These strategies were applied more frequently by the high achievement learners. Cognitive strategy is a deep strategy (Shmais, 2004; Leaver, Ehrman, and Shekhtman, 2005) referring to relating new information with the already existed knowledge. Some examples are saying or writing in English, trying to imitate native speakers of English, avoiding translation to L1, using words in different ways, and writing notes in English. All of these specific

strategies need students' proficiency to some extent and since the high groups from both ethnic groups possess a higher level of English competency, they can use cognitive strategies more comfortably.

Memory strategies were utilized by Muslim more than non-Muslim students. English language is the third and second foreign language to Muslim and non-Muslim learners respectively. Compared with other strategies, acquiring new languages through rote learning such as memorization ranging from remembering new words and sentences, using flashcards, acting out, and reviewing English lessons seem to be easier than other dimensions of English language strategies. Memory strategies require only the effort to memorize and need smaller range of English knowledge compared to cognitive and compensation strategies. To employ certain strategies as a short cut to embrace English as a third language and at a surface level of knowledge, Muslim students seem to rely more on memory strategies than non-Muslim learners do. Furthermore, Muslim high achievers used social strategies the least while non-Muslim high achievers adopted the least of memory strategies. For Muslim students, it can be explained by the sensitivity in religious demanding that students have limitations in socializing with others especially female students (El-Dib, 2004).

## 8.2 Personality traits displayed by Muslim and non-Muslim students

### 8.2.1 The personality traits of Muslim high and low achievers

Extroversion style of personality has long been associated with the success in language learning in massive amount of investigation. The common belief is that those with extroversion personality related to outgoingness, openness, comfortably being conversationalists are prone to get higher proficiency in language learning achievement (Lightbown and Spada, 2006). However, this may not be relevant with these Muslim high performers embracing introvert type of personality at hand in which merely being calm, quiet; enjoying solitude; and preferring space are involved in their behaviors.

The interpretation may be explained with the language production. The introverted students tend to be more reserved enjoying privacy. To involve in language communication, they are usually slow to initiate or participate in a conversation, but the quality and accuracy are better than the extroverted students. The extroversion learners might produce an outcome of less quality compared with their counterparts. This was observed in Wong (2011)'s study that introverted student usually accomplished the homework with higher quality.

Muslim low achievers displayed extroversion dimension of personality traits. The result is controversial with the belief that most of scholars proposed that the extroversion should be a better learner than the introversion. For these low performers, their extroversion was clearly caught in the interview; they normally enjoyed getting into communication. This is the reason why their oral ability was found better than the extrovert students (Gan, 2008). However, their proficiency in language learning, not only pure spoken language would be tested, but other skills which their competencies might be lower than their counterparts.

#### 8.2.2 The personality traits of non-Muslim high and low achievers

Both groups are "clear" and "very clear" extrovert who also possess "moderate" and "slight" introvert traits. The dominant extrovert trait was clearly perceived during the interviews with these two groups. They were not reserved but very eager to express themselves. They were highly confident talking in groups especially the low achievers who seemed to be rather talkative.

Related to assertiveness, extrovert students were found to be a significant variable linked to oral ability (Ockey, 2011). However, the less extrovert students among non-Muslim students in this study were found owning higher proficiency. It might be explained by the quality of their production. Based on definition proposed by Quenk and Kummerow (2001), the interpretation can be that the high achievement extrovert tend to contribute only what they know well while the low achievement extrovert may volunteer their ideas even though they are not correct or relevant. This might lead to different qualities of their outcome. It is possible that the production of non-Muslim high performers seems to be going with more quality.

### 8.2.3 The personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim students

Contrasting with the commonly known, it was found in this current study that only Muslim high performers exhibited clear introversion personality while the non-Muslim students are either “clear” and “very clear” extrovert. The reservedness of Muslim society may -to some extent- play a role to explain the difference (El-Dib, 2004). The preference of introversion type in Muslim society may create a typical acceptance that being an introvert refers to proper manner and respect.

Based on the finding that the others were found to be extrovert—Muslim low achievers, and non-Muslim both high and low achievers, leaving Muslim high performers to be exceptionally introvert students, it could be assumed as follows. First, the current findings suggest that personality traits do not tie to achievement level, and it is situation-dependent based on Ellis’ (1994) explanation. According to Gan (2008), both might be expert in different ways; the introverted are better in written language, while the extroverted seem at ease in oral communication and some of them might do better in producing language accuracy. Relevant to others’ observation, Carrell, Prince and Astika (1996) found the introvert were better at vocabulary knowledge and the latter was relevant with Wakamoto’s (2009) study. He found that the extrovert were likely to seek out opportunities to use foreign language outside of classroom. Another implication might explain with characteristic of students. When comparing specifically on introversion among high and high, low and low achievers, it was found that non-Muslim students rather possessed extroversion while the Muslim were likely to be introvert.

## 9. Implications of the study

### 9.1 Language learning strategies:

Based on the results, the study suggests implications which will be emphasized on educational setting:

First is raising learners’ awareness regarding English language learning strategies use. Since it is found that ethnicity provides impact on employing strategies and learners from different ethnicities employ different strategies to learn English

language, teachers should offer instructions and activities explicitly which cover all dimensions of strategies. To further illustrate, teachers should provide learners with a set of strategies that can be used to learn English and those strategies should be delicately explained and modeled by teachers, or teachers might conduct a self-report questionnaire to elicit learners' strategies based on learners' perception. On every activity offered by teacher, students might note down strategies they have used to accomplish the activities then have them share with other learners how they use those strategies.

Second is strategies reflection. It is one way to encourage students to utilize strategies. Even though Muslim and non-Muslim high performers are found of using wider strategies, it could be noted down in affirmative way that they understand strategies more than their counterpart. Thus, strategies should be reflected to encourage their understanding which could make all students-high and low achievers-affectively apply strategies in learning English. However, the emphasis should be given on those low achievers

Third is the provision of a wide range of activities that match or enhance more than memory strategies. These students are found of being attracted and interested in learning English from listening to music, watching films and videos form the Internet. Therefore, teachers might have to adapt new approach of teaching to meet the effectiveness of being a language learner. The selection of relevant topic or content of the materials to suit learners' interest might be worth trying. For example, in English class, expressions might be learned or imitated through songs, movies and role play.

Four is the popular use of metacognitive strategies. It should be considered as a good sign that students from both Muslim and non-Muslim ethnic backgrounds valued strategies related to language management strategies. Metacognitive is very important and if it is properly modeled and transferred, it would benefit students to approach individual or autonomous learning. Thus, teachers should promote students with direct practice and enrich the understanding of metacognitive strategies.

## 9.2 Extroversion and introversion personality traits:

1. Based on the finding that one group of students with high proficiency displayed introversion personality, as opposed to the common belief that the more extrovert the students, the greater success the students could accomplish, teachers now should bear in mind, and as well their perception and attitudes should be changed that there is the power hidden in the introvert students.
2. The personality traits found in this study can help teachers understand their students' personalities of Muslim and non-Muslim learners and these can be used as a guideline to a develop learning context that suits students' personalities or to individualize teaching those students. Thus, creating the balance of classroom environment to facilitate language learning of both traits should be pursued. Due to the fact that the extrovert tend to encounter comfortably with spontaneous situation and tend to speak with non-inhibition, while the introvert prefer to work alone and take time to accomplish the task, the classroom activities should cover both styles of preferences.
3. This study revealed that low achievement students both Muslim and non-Muslim are extrovert. This can be implied that being extrovert sometimes may not help them in learning. However, since personality is situationally dependent, it could assure of the circumstances that the personality could be changed. Being extrovert might be advantageous to some situation of language learning such as to speak in front of others, and being introvert could produce better written work as proposed by studies that previously reviewed. To train students, English teachers can make use of this trait in designing relevant activities as these students are willing to participate in class. By doing this the poor extrovert and introvert students can improve their proficiency.

## **10. Recommendations for future research**

1. Language background is the only variable selected in the study, thus to include others might be worth trying to fulfill the limitations, for example, the impact of motivation, anxiety, preference and perception towards language learning strategies.
2. Personality traits study might be conducted to replicate for more consistent results. For example, there is a general consensus that the extroversion students are better at

oral work more than written work and the introvert are better at writing. These need to be further confirmed.

3. The accuracy of personality traits might be difficult to pinpoint directly, thus it is suggested to observe with various assessments and means. The future study can include class observations, think aloud protocols, or portfolios for more thorough data and more precise conclusion.

## REFERENCES

- Abu Shmais, W. (2004). The English Language Learning Strategies of An-Najah National University EFL Majors. Retrieved from <http://repository.yu.edu.jo:80/handle/123456789/530264>
- Alhaisoni, E. (2012). Language Learning Strategy Use of Saudi EFL Students in an Intensive English Learning Context. *Asian Social Sciences*, 8 (13), 115-127
- Anderson, N. J. (2008). Metacognitive and the good language learner. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lesson from good language learners* (pp. 99-109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Briggs, K. C., & Myers, I. B. (n.d.) *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Retrieved from website: [imbti.googlecode.com/files/mbti.test.doc](http://imbti.googlecode.com/files/mbti.test.doc)
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-Extraversion and the Efl Proficiency of Japanese Students. *Language Learning*, 32(1), 109–132. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1982.tb00521.x
- Carrell, P. L., Prince, M. S., & Astika, G. G. (1996). Personality Types and Language Learning in an EFL Context. *Language Learning*, 46(1), 75–99. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb00641.x
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Furnham, A. and Petrides, K. (2006). Personality and intelligence. The relationship of Eysenck's Giant Three with verbal and numerical ability. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 27 (3), 147-150.
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2012). Personality in Second Language Acquisition. In Carol A. Chapelle (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.



- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: construction, administration, and processing* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ehrman, M. (2008). Personality and good language learners. In Griffiths (Ed.) *Lessons from Good Language Learners*. (pp. 61-72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- El-Dib, M. A. B. (2004). Language Learning Strategies in Kuwait: Links to Gender, Language Level, and Culture in a Hybrid Context. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(1), 85–95. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02176.x
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Gan, Z. (2008). Extroversion and group oral performance: A mixed quantitative and discourse analysis approach. *The Hong Kong Institution of Education*, 23(3), 116-127.
- Gan, Z., Humphreys, G., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2004). Understanding Successful and Unsuccessful EFL Students in Chinese Universities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(2), 229–244. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00227.x
- Gerami, M. H., & Baighlou, S. M. G. (2011). Language Learning Strategies Used by Successful and Unsuccessful Iranian EFL Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1567–1576. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.399
- Grainger, P. R. (1997). Language-Learning Strategies for Learners of Japanese: Investigating Ethnicity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(3), 378–385. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1997.tb02360.x

- Grainger, P. (2012). The impact of cultural background on the choice of language learning strategies in the JFL context. *System*, 40(4), 483–493.  
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.10.011>
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995). A Closer Look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender [Abstract]. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261–297.  
 doi:10.2307/3587625
- Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language-learning strategies: theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 247–254. doi:10.1093/elt/55.3.247
- Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System*, 31(3), 367–383. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00048-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00048-4)
- Hsieh, A. F.-Y. (2014). The effect of cultural background and language proficiency on the use of oral communication strategies by second language learners of Chinese. *System*, 45, 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.04.002>
- Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, 34(3), 399–415.  
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.02.002>
- Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kezwer, P. (1987). The Extroverted Vs. the Introverted Personality and Second Language Learning. *TESL Canada Journal*, 5(1), 45–58.
- Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of Language Learning Strategies Used by Palestinian EFL Learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(1), 108–117.  
 doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02458.x
- Khamkhien, A. (2010). Factors affecting language learning strategy reported usage by Thai and Vietnamese EFL learners. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 7(1), 66-85.

- Leaver, B. L., Ehrman, M. E., & Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving success in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned*. (3rd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Macaro, E. (2001). *Learning strategies in foreign and second language classrooms*. London: Continuum
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1994). Toward a Social Psychological Model of Strategy Use. *Foreign Language Annals*, 27(2), 185–195. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1994.tb01201.x
- Magogwe, J. M., & Oliver, R. (2007). The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System*, 35(3), 338–352. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.01.003>
- Marin-Marin, A. (2005). Extraversion and the use of vocabulary learning strategies among university EFL students in Mexico (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Essex). Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net>
- Nikoopour, J., & Amini Farsani, M. (2010). On the relationship between language learning strategies and personality types among Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of English Students*, 1(1), 81-101.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ockey, G. (2011). Self-Consciousness and Assertiveness as Explanatory Variables of L2 Oral Ability: A Latent Variable Approach. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 968–89. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00625.x.

- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1–23. doi:10.1016/0346-251X(94)00047-A
- Oxford, R. L., & Ehrman, M. E. (1995). Adults' language learning strategies in an intensive foreign language program in the United States. *System*, 23(3), 359–386. doi:10.1016/0346-251X(95)00023-D
- Park, G.-P. (1997). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency in Korean University Students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(2), 211–221. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1997.tb02343.x
- Qingquan, N., Chatupote, M., & Teo, A. (2008). A Deep Look into Learning Strategy Use by Successful and Unsuccessful Students in the Chinese EFL Learning Context. *RELC Journal*, 39(3), 338–358. doi:10.1177/0033688208096845
- Quenk, N. L. (2009). *Essentials of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator assessment* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Quenk, N., & Kummerow, J. (2001). MBTI Step II Interpretive Report. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Riazi, A. (2007). Language Learning Strategy Use: Perceptions of Female Arab English Majors. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(3), 433–440.
- Rovinelli, R. J., & Hambleton, R. K. (1977). On the Use of Content Specialists in the Assessment of Criterion-Referenced Test Item Validity. *Dutch Journal for Education Reserch*, 2, 49-60. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED121845>
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the “Good Language Learner” Can Teach Us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41. doi:10.2307/3586011

- Rubin, J. (1987). Learner Strategies: theoretical assumptions. Research history and typology. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, 15-30. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Saiyarin, R. (2011). *Language Learning Strategies Use by Students at Different Proficiency Level* (Unpublished minor thesis). Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vallin, M., & Akesson, S. (2012). Learning environment in Thailand: A case study regarding teaching methods and motivation in a Thai school. Retrieved from: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:603432/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Wenden, A., & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wharton, G. (2000). Language Learning Strategy Use of Bilingual Foreign Language Learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 203–243.  
doi:10.1111/0023-8333.00117
- Wil, J., and Revelle, W. (2009). Extraversion. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.) *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior*, 257-273. New York, NY : Guilford.
- Wong, E. (2011). Extraversion and introversion in second-language acquisition: a literature review. *日本大学歯学部紀要*, 39, 1-10.
- Yabukoshi, T., & Takeuchi, O. (2009). Language learning strategies used by lower secondary school learners in a Japanese EFL context1. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 136–172. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00221.x

**APPENDIX A**

**English Version of Language Learning Strategies Questionnaire**

### **Questionnaire on Language Learning Strategies**

The questionnaire is designed for one purpose, which is to examine how students manage to study English in terms of employing language learning strategies to facilitate their learning.

All the information students have provided will be used merely for research purpose. Note that your responses will not affect your grades at all. More importantly, it will be secured absolutely confidential.

The questionnaire form consists of three parts. There is no right or wrong answer, so please give response in every part and every item.

*Part 1: 4 items of Personal Background Information*

*Part 2: 50 items of Language Learning Strategies*

*Part 3: Other opinions*

**Part 1: Personal Background Information**

Gender \_\_\_\_\_ Grade \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_

Your English score on O-NET test \_\_\_\_\_

.....

**Part 2: Language Learning Strategies or Techniques you use to help you learn English better.**

Direction: This section contains 50 items of learning strategies. Please read carefully and tick ( / ) from 1 to 5 level of frequency use of learning strategies.

The number 1 to 5 mean:

1. I never or almost never use this strategy	(0-20%)
2. I sometimes use this strategy	(20-40%)
3. I usually use this strategy	(40-60%)
4. I often use this strategy	(60-80%)
5. I always or almost always use this strategy	(80-100%)

Item	Language Learning Strategy	Frequency use				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things that I learn in English.					
2	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.					



3	I connect the sound of a new English word and a picture of the word to help me remember the word.					
4	I remember a new English word by imagining a situation in which the word might be used.					
5	I use similar sounds to remember new English word. For example, “believe” and “receive” have the same sound, so I put them in the same group					
6	I use flashcards to remember new English words.					
7	I physically act out new English words.					
8	I review English lessons often.					
9	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location, for example, on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.					
10	I say or write new English words many times.					
11	I try to talk like native English speakers.					
12	I practice the sounds of English.					
13	I use the English words I know in different ways.					
14	I start conversations in English.					
15	I watch movies with English soundtrack.					
16	I read for pleasure in English.					
17	I write notes in English.					
18	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully again.					

19	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.					
20	I study English sentences structure in order to get the language patterns to be used later.					
21	I find the meaning of English words by dividing it into parts that I can understand.					
22	I try not to translate word-for-word.					
23	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.					
24	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.					
25	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gesture.					
26	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.					
27	I read English without looking up every new word.					
28	I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.					
29	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.					
30	I try to find chances that I can to use English.					
31	I notice my English mistakes and use it to help me do better.					
32	I pay attention when someone is speaking English.					
33	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.					

34	I organize my timetable so I will have enough time to study English.					
35	I look for people I can talk to in English.					
36	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.					
37	I have clear goals for improving my English skills, for example, listening and speaking skills.					
38	I think about my progress in learning English.					
39	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.					
40	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.					
41	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.					
42	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.					
43	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.					
44	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.					
45	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.					
46	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.					
47	I practice English with other students.					
48	I ask for help from English speakers.					
49	I ask questions in English.					

50	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.					
----	---	--	--	--	--	--

***Part 3:***

**3.1. What are the other language learning strategies you use apart from the above?**

---

---

---

---

.....

**APPENDIX B**

**English Version of Personality Traits Questionnaire**

### **Questionnaire on Personality Traits**

The questionnaire is designed for one purpose, which is to investigate the two personality traits students display; extroversion and introversion.

All the information students have provided will be used merely for research purpose. Note that your responses will not affect your grades at all. More importantly, it will be secured absolutely confidential.

The questionnaire form consists of three parts. There is no right or wrong answer, so please give response in every part and every item.

*Part 1:* 4 items of Personal Background Information

*Part 2:* 11 items of Personality Traits

*Part 3:* Other opinions

**Part 1: Personal Background Information**

Gender \_\_\_\_\_ Grade \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_

Your English score on O-NET test \_\_\_\_\_

.....

**Part 2 : Extroversion and Introversion Personality Trait**

Direction: read each question carefully and circle ( o ) only one of the two choices ('A' and 'B') and circle the answer that applies to you.

**I. Which answer comes closer to telling how you usually feel or act?**

1. Are you usually
  - a. a “good mixer”, or
  - b. rather quiet and reserved?
2. Among your friends are you
  - a. full of news about everybody, or
  - b. one of the last to hear what is going on?
3. Do you tend to have
  - a. broad friendships with many different people, or
  - b. deep friendship with very few people?
4. When you are with the group of people, would you usually rather
  - a. join in the talk of the group, or
  - b. imaginative people?
5. Do you
  - a. talk easily to almost anyone for as long as you have to, or
  - b. find a lot to say only to certain people or under certain conditions?
6. In a large group, do you more often
  - a. introduce others, or
  - b. get introduced?

- 7. Can the new people you meet tell what you are interested in
  - a. right away, or
  - b. only after they really get to know you?
- 8. Do you usually
  - a. show your feelings freely, or
  - b. keep your feelings to yourself?

**II. Which word in each pair appeals to you more?**

- 9. a. quiet
  - b. hearty
- 10. a. reserved
  - b. talkative
- 11. a. calm
  - b. lively

***Part 3:***

**3.1. How do you perceive your own personality when you study English language?**

---

---

---

---

.....



**APPENDIX C**

**English Version of Guided Interview Items**

### Interview Questions

General	1. How long have you been studying English?
Memory	2. What do you do to memorize new words or phrases?
	3. How often you review your lesson? And is it often occurred before or after class? do you think it works?
Cognitive	4. How do you practice you skills; reading, writing, listening, and speaking?
Compensation	5. What would you do if you found a problem of understanding while speaking and listening? Have you ever experienced it before? What do you do to solve the problem?
	6. What would you do if you found a problem of understanding while reading and writing?
Metacognitive	7. Do you spend some time outside the classroom to study English? Why (not)? and how?
	8. Do you wish to improve your English? How do you expect to do it?
Affective	9. What is your attitude towards learning English? Have you ever told anyone how you feel about English?
	10. Do you like studying English? Do you study it because you love it or you think knowing English will get you a good job? What are your reasons?
	11. What do you do if you get stressed when studying English?
Social	12. How do you feel about speaking English in classroom with teacher, friends, and in front of the classroom? Why?
	13. Do you like to practice English with others or on your own? Why?

Extroversion/  Introversion	14. Do you like talking to people you do not know? How often? Why?
	15. How often you attend social gathering, go outside and spend time with friend? How do you like it? Why?
	16. Do you always express your opinion among your close friends or a group of people?
	17. In English language classroom, do you like group activity or individual activity the most? Why?
	18. What would you prefer to do on holiday? Why?
	19. When confronted with a sudden question in the classroom, do you always answer it first or wait for someone else's response? Why?

**APPENDIX D**

**Thai Version of Language Learning Strategies Questionnaire**

### แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับกลยุทธ์หรือเทคนิคการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษ

คำชี้แจงแบบสอบถามฉบับนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อรวบรวมรายละเอียดเกี่ยวกับกลยุทธ์หรือเทคนิคที่นักเรียนใช้การเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษ

ข้อมูลที่ได้จะนำไปใช้เพื่อการวิจัยเท่านั้นการตอบแบบสอบถามครั้งนี้จะไม่มีผลกระทบใดๆต่อคะแนนนักเรียน และข้อมูลจะถูกเก็บเป็นความลับ

แบบสอบถามนี้แบ่งออกเป็น3ส่วนคำตอบของท่านจะไม่ถือว่าเป็นคำตอบผิดหรือถูก กรุณาตอบทุกข้อ

ส่วนที่1คำถามทั่วไปเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลของนักเรียนที่ตอบแบบสอบถามมีทั้งหมด4ข้อ

ส่วนที่2คำถามเกี่ยวกับกลยุทธ์และเทคนิคการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษมีทั้งหมด50ข้อ

ส่วนที่3ความคิดเห็นเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับกลยุทธ์หรือเทคนิคการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษ

**ตอนที่1** ข้อมูลส่วนตัว

เพศ \_\_\_\_\_ ชั้น \_\_\_\_\_

โรงเรียน \_\_\_\_\_

คะแนนO-NET วิชาภาษาอังกฤษ \_\_\_\_\_

**ตอนที่2** กลยุทธ์หรือเทคนิคที่ใช้การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

คำชี้แจงแบบสอบถามมีทั้งหมด**50** ข้อ กรุณาอ่านข้อความและขีดเครื่องหมาย( / ) ในช่อง  
หมายเลขที่ตรงกับระดับความถี่เกี่ยวกับกลยุทธ์หรือเทคนิคที่ใช้การเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

ความหมายของตัวเลขในตัวเลือก:

1 หมายถึงฉันใช้กลยุทธ์ดังกล่าวน้อยที่สุดหรือเกือบจะไม่ได้ใช้เลย(0-20%)
2 หมายถึงฉันใช้กลยุทธ์ดังกล่าวน้อย(20-40%)
3 หมายถึงฉันใช้กลยุทธ์ดังกล่าวปานกลาง(40-60%)
4 หมายถึงฉันใช้กลยุทธ์ดังกล่าวมาก(60-80%)
5 หมายถึงฉันใช้กลยุทธ์ดังกล่าวมากถึงมากที่สุด(80-100%)

ข้อ	กลยุทธ์หรือเทคนิคในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ	ระดับความถี่ในการใช้กลยุทธ์				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	ฉันพยายามเชื่อมโยงความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างสิ่งที่ฉันกำลังเรียนกับสิ่งที่ได้เรียนไปแล้ว					

2	ฉันนำคำศัพท์ที่เพิ่งเรียนมาแต่งประโยคเพื่อให้จำคำศัพท์นั้นได้					
3	ฉันเชื่อมโยงเสียงของคำศัพท์ใหม่กับรูปภาพเกี่ยวกับคำศัพท์นั้นเพื่อให้จำคำศัพท์ได้ง่ายขึ้น					
4	ฉันจดจำคำศัพท์ใหม่ๆ โดยการนึกถึงภาพเหตุการณ์ที่จะนำคำศัพท์นั้นไปใช้					
5	ฉันใช้เสียงคล้องจองเพื่อช่วยในการจดจำคำศัพท์ใหม่ๆ เช่นคำว่า <b>believe</b> และ <b>receive</b> ออกเสียงเหมือนกันฉันจึงจัดให้ทั้งสองคำอยู่ในกลุ่มเดียวกัน					
6	ฉันใช้บัตรคำเพื่อช่วยจำคำศัพท์ใหม่ๆ					
7	ฉันแสดงท่าทางประกอบเพื่อให้จดจำคำศัพท์					
8	ฉันทบทวนบทเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเสมอๆ					
9	ฉันจดจำคำศัพท์หรือวลีใหม่ๆ โดยการจดจำตำแหน่งที่คำหรือวลีนั้นปรากฏ เช่นบนหน้าหนังสือบนกระดานคำหรือบนป้ายประกาศตามท้องถนน					
10	ฉันพูดหรือเขียนคำศัพท์ใหม่หลายๆ ครั้งเพื่อจดจำ					
11	ฉันพยายามพูดให้เหมือนกับเจ้าของภาษา					
12	ฉันฝึกการออกเสียงภาษาอังกฤษ					
13	ฉันใช้คำศัพท์ที่ได้เรียนรู้มาในหลากหลายรูปแบบ					
14	ฉันเป็นฝ่ายเริ่มสนทนาเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					
15	ฉันดูภาพยนตร์เป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					
16	ฉันอ่านหนังสือที่เป็นภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อความเพลิดเพลิน					
17	ฉันจดบันทึกเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					

18	เมื่ออ่านบทความเป็นอังกฤษฉันเริ่มต้นด้วยการอ่านอย่างคร่าวๆก่อนแล้วค่อยย้อนกลับมาอ่านอย่างละเอียดอีกครั้ง					
19	ฉันหาคำศัพท์ภาษาไทยที่มีความหมายเหมือนหรือใกล้เคียงกับความหมายของคำนั้นในภาษาอังกฤษ					
20	ฉันพยายามศึกษาโครงสร้างของประโยคภาษาอังกฤษเพื่อให้ได้รูปแบบประโยคที่จะนำไปใช้ได้ต่อไป					
21	ฉันหาความหมายของคำศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษโดยแบ่งคำศัพท์นั้นออกเป็นส่วนตัวต่างๆที่ฉันเข้าใจ					
22	ฉันพยายามไม่แปลความหมายจากภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาไทยคำต่อคำ					
23	ฉันสรุปข้อมูลที่ได้ฟังหรืออ่านเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ					
24	ฉันคาดเดาความหมายเมื่อพบคำศัพท์ใหม่ที่ไม่รู้จัก					
25	ฉันใช้ท่าทางประกอบในการสนทนาเมื่อนึกคำศัพท์ไม่ออก					
26	ฉันคิดคำใหม่ขึ้นมาหากไม่รู้คำศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษที่ถูกต้อง					
27	ฉันอ่านภาษาอังกฤษโดยไม่หาความหมายของคำใหม่ทุกคำ					
28	ฉันพยายามคาดเดาสิ่งที่คู่สนทนากำลังจะพูด					
29	ฉันใช้คำหรือวลีที่มีความหมายใกล้เคียงหากฉันนึกคำศัพท์นั้นในภาษาอังกฤษไม่ออก					
30	ฉันพยายามหาโอกาสที่จะใช้ภาษาอังกฤษให้มากที่สุดเท่าที่จะเป็นไปได้					
31	ฉันสังเกตข้อผิดพลาดในการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษของฉันและนำมาปรับปรุงตนเอง					
32	ฉันพยายามตั้งใจฟังคนอื่นพูดภาษาอังกฤษ					



33	ฉันพยายามหาวิธีที่จะเป็นผู้เรียนภาษาที่ดี					
34	ฉันจัดตารางเวลาเพื่อให้มีเวลาเพียงพอที่จะศึกษาและทบทวนภาษาอังกฤษ					
35	ฉันพยายามหาคนที่สามารถจะพูดภาษาอังกฤษด้วยได้					
36	ฉันพยายามหาโอกาสเพื่อให้ได้อ่านภาษาอังกฤษมากเท่าที่จะเป็นไปได้					
37	ฉันมีเป้าหมายที่ชัดเจนในการพัฒนาทักษะภาษาอังกฤษเช่นการฟังและการพูด					
38	ฉันคิดถึงความก้าวหน้าของตนเองในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ					
39	ฉันพยายามผ่อนคลายเมื่อเกิดความรู้สึกวิตกกังวลและประหม่าเวลาใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ					
40	ฉันให้กำลังใจตนเองในการพูดภาษาอังกฤษถึงแม้ว่าจะพูดผิดก็ตาม					
41	ฉันให้รางวัลตัวเองเมื่อฉันใช้ภาษาอังกฤษได้ดี					
42	ฉันพยายามสังเกตว่าตนเองเครียด/ประหม่าหรือไม่เวลาเรียนหรือใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ					
43	ฉันจดบันทึกความรู้สึกในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ					
44	ฉันพูดคุยกับผู้อื่นถึงความรู้สึกเวลาเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ					
45	ถ้าฉันไม่เข้าใจผู้อื่นในการสนทนาภาษาอังกฤษฉันจะขอให้เขาพูดช้าลงหรือทวนซ้ำ					
46	ฉันขอให้เจ้าของภาษาช่วยแก้ไขเมื่อฉันพูดไม่ถูกต้อง					
47	ฉันฝึกใช้ภาษาอังกฤษกับนักเรียนคนอื่นๆ					
48	ฉันขอความช่วยเหลือจากเจ้าของภาษา					

49	ฉันทามคำถามเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ						
50	ฉันทายามเรียนรู้วัฒนธรรมของเจ้าของภาษา						

### ตอนที่ 3

#### 3.1. นอกจากกลยุทธ์ข้างต้นแล้วนักเรียนที่เทคนิคใดอีกบ้างที่ใช้ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ

---



---



---



---

.....

**APPENDIX E**

**Thai Version of Personality Traits Questionnaire**

### แบบสอบถามเกี่ยวกับบุคลิกภาพเฉพาะตนของนักเรียน

คำชี้แจงแบบสอบถามฉบับนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อรวบรวมรายละเอียดเกี่ยวกับบุคลิกลักษณะเฉพาะตนของนักเรียน

ข้อมูลที่ได้จะนำไปใช้เพื่อการวิจัยเท่านั้นการตอบแบบสอบถามครั้งนี้จะไม่มีผลกระทบต่อคะแนนนักเรียน และข้อมูลจะถูกเก็บเป็นความลับ

แบบสอบถามนี้แบ่งออกเป็น3ส่วนคำตอบของท่านจะไม่ถือว่าเป็นคำตอบผิดหรือถูก กรุณาตอบทุกข้อ

#### แบบสอบถามนี้แบ่งออกเป็น3ส่วน

ส่วนที่1คำถามทั่วไปเกี่ยวกับข้อมูลของนักเรียนที่ตอบแบบสอบถามมีทั้งหมด4ข้อ

ส่วนที่2คำถามเกี่ยวกับบุคลิกภาพเฉพาะตนของนักเรียนมีทั้งหมด11ข้อ

ส่วนที่3ความคิดเห็นเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับบุคลิกภาพเฉพาะตนของนักเรียน

### ตอนที่1 ข้อมูลส่วนตัว

เพศ \_\_\_\_\_ ชั้น \_\_\_\_\_

โรงเรียน \_\_\_\_\_

คะแนนO-NET วิชาภาษาอังกฤษ \_\_\_\_\_

.....

### ตอนที่2 บุคลิกภาพของนักเรียน

คำชี้แจงแบบสอบถามในตอนนี้ประกอบไปด้วย11 คำถามแบ่งเป็นตอนก8 ข้อและตอนข3 ข้อ กรุณาอ่านข้อความและวงกลม( O )คำตอบเพียงหนึ่งข้อระหว่าง1 และ2 ที่บ่งบอกความเป็นตัวเรามากที่สุด

#### ก.ข้อใดต่อไปนี้บ่งบอกความเป็นตัวนักเรียนมากที่สุด?

1. คุณมักจะเป็นคนที่ \_\_\_\_\_
  1. เปิดเผย
  2. เงียบ
2. ในกลุ่มเพื่อนห้องของคุณคุณมักจะเป็น \_\_\_\_\_
  1. คนที่มีเรื่องเล่ามาเล่าให้เพื่อนฟังตลอดเวลา
  2. คนสุดท้ายที่รับรู้เรื่องที่เพื่อนๆกำลังคุยกันหรือรู้ว่ากำลังเกิดอะไรขึ้น
3. คุณเป็นคนที่มี \_\_\_\_\_
  1. สัมพันธไมตรีกับเพื่อนในวงกว้าง
  2. สัมพันธไมตรีที่สนิทสนมกับกลุ่มเพื่อนในวงเล็กๆ
4. เมื่อคุณอยู่กับเพื่อนๆคุณมักจะ \_\_\_\_\_
  1. เข้าร่วมวงสนทนาพูดคุยกับเพื่อน
  2. ฟังเพื่อนๆแล้วจินตนาการถึงเรื่องราวที่กำลังพูดคุยกันอยู่
5. คุณสามารถ \_\_\_\_\_
  1. คุยเรื่องอะไรกับใครก็ได้และสามารถคุยได้เป็นเวลานานๆ

2. คุณได้หลายเรื่องแต่เฉพาะกับเพื่อนบางคนหรือบางสถานการณ์เท่านั้น

6. คุณมักจะเป็นคน \_\_\_\_\_

1. แนะนำคนอื่นๆให้รู้จักกัน
2. ที่ถูกเพื่อนแนะนำต่อเพื่อนคนอื่นๆ

7. เพื่อนใหม่ที่คุณเพิ่งรู้จักสามารถบอกได้ว่าคุณสนใจสิ่งใด \_\_\_\_\_

1. ทันทีที่ได้รู้จักคุณ
2. ก็ต่อเมื่อรู้จักคุณดีแล้วเท่านั้น

8. คุณมักจะ \_\_\_\_\_

1. แสดงความรู้สึกอย่างเปิดเผย
2. เก็บความรู้สึก

ข. คำศัพท์ใดต่อไปนี้อธิบายตัวคุณมากที่สุด

9.      1. เงียบขรึม      2. ร่าเริง
10.     1. ชอบเก็บตัว      2. ช่างพูด
11.     1. เฉยๆ            2. กระตือรือร้น

ตอนที่ 3

**3.1. นักเรียนมีมุมมองอย่างไรเกี่ยวกับบุคลิกของตนเองในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ**

---



---



---



---

.....

**APPENDIX F**

**Thai Version of Guided Interview Items**

**คำถามในการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่ม**

General	1. นักเรียนได้เรียนภาษาอังกฤษมาแล้วกี่ปี
Memory	2. นักเรียนได้ใช้วิธีการใดบ้างเพื่อจดจำคำศัพท์หรือประโยคใหม่ๆ
	3. นักเรียนได้ศึกษาบทเรียนบ่อยเพียงใดนักเรียนอ่านหนังสือเพื่อเตรียมตัวก่อนเรียนหรือทบทวนหลังเลิกเรียนวิธีดังกล่าวใช้ได้ผลหรือไม่
Cognitive	4. นักเรียนใช้วิธีการใดในการฝึกและพัฒนาทักษะการฟังพูดอ่านเขียน
Compensation	5. สมมุติว่านักเรียนไม่เข้าใจในสิ่งที่คู่สนทนาพูดมีวิธีการแก้ปัญหาอย่างไรนักเรียนเคยประสบปัญหาในสถานการณ์จริงหรือไม่นักเรียนทำอย่างไรเพื่อแก้ปัญหา
	6. สมมุติว่านักเรียนพบปัญหาเกี่ยวกับความเข้าใจในระหว่างอ่านหรือว่าเขียนนักเรียนจะมีวิธีการรับมืออย่างไร
Metacognitive	7. นักเรียนเคยใช้เวลาว่างจากคาบเรียนเพื่อฝึกหรือเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเพิ่มเติมหรือไม่อย่างไร
	8. นักเรียนเคยคิดถึงเรื่องการพัฒนาทักษะความสามารถภาษาอังกฤษบ้างหรือไม่เคยคิดหรือไม่ว่าจะพัฒนาอย่างไร
Affective	9. นักเรียนมีทัศนคติอย่างไรต่อการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเคยบอกความรู้สึกตัวเองที่มีต่อภาษาอังกฤษให้คนอื่นได้รับรู้บ้างหรือไม่
	10. นักเรียนชอบภาษาอังกฤษหรือไม่นักเรียนเรียนภาษาอังกฤษเพราะว่าใจรักหรือคิดว่าการเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษจะทำให้เราไต่งานดีๆในอนาคตนักเรียนมีเหตุผลอะไรบ้าง
	11. นักเรียนจะทําอย่างไรเมื่อรู้สึกเครียดจากการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ



Social	12. นักเรียนรู้สึกอย่างไรเมื่อต้องสนทนากับครูเพื่อนหรือต้องออกไปพูดหน้าชั้นเป็นภาษาอังกฤษ
	13. นักเรียนชอบฝึกภาษาอังกฤษกับเพื่อนๆหรือฝึกคนเดียวกับตัวเองเพราะเหตุใด
Extraversion/ Introversion	14. นักเรียนชอบพูดกับคนที่ไม่เคยรู้จักมาก่อนหรือไม่บ่อยเพียงใดเพราะเหตุใด
	15. นักเรียนเข้าสังคมหรืออยู่กับเพื่อนบ่อยเพียงใดนักเรียนชอบเวลาอยู่กับเพื่อนๆหรือไม่เพราะเหตุใด
	16. นักเรียนมักจะชอบแสดงความคิดเห็นเฉพาะในกลุ่มเพื่อนสนิทหรือในกลุ่มคนทั่วไป
	17. ในการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษนักเรียนชอบกิจกรรมที่ทำเป็นกลุ่มหรือทำคนเดียวเพราะเหตุใด
	18. นักเรียนชอบใช้เวลาวันหยุดทำกิจกรรมอะไรเพราะเหตุใด
	19. เวลาคุณครูถามคำถามในห้องเรียนนักเรียนมักจะเป็นคนแรกที่ตอบหรือรอให้เพื่อนตอบก่อนเพราะเหตุใด

PAPER 1

English Language Learning Strategies: A Comparison between Muslim and Non-Muslim Students.

English Language learning strategies:  
A Comparison between Muslim and Non-Muslim Students

กลยุทธ์การเรียนรู้ภาษาอังกฤษ: การศึกษาข้อเปรียบเทียบ  
ระหว่างนักเรียนมุสลิมและนักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิม

*Munir Laeha*<sup>1</sup>

มุนีร์ แลฮา

*Nisakorn Charumane*<sup>2</sup>

นิสากร จารุมนี

**Abstract**

This study aimed to compare English language learning strategies (ELLSs) use among and within two different mother tongue groups: Muslims whose mother tongue was Melayu and non-Muslims whose mother tongue was Thai. Using purposive sampling, the subjects comprised 424 Mattayomsuksa 4 students; 209 high and 101 low achiever Muslims, 59 high and 55 low achiever non-Muslims using Ordinary National Educational Test (O-NET) test scores of English. To access ELLSs, the study employed two instruments: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning for non-native speaker strategy assessment (SILL version 7.0) and group interviews. The results showed that

---

<sup>1</sup> M.A. Student (Teaching English as an International Language), Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus, Email:

[munir\\_leaha@yahoo.com](mailto:munir_leaha@yahoo.com)

นักศึกษาปริญญาโท (สาขาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษานานาชาติ) ภาควิชาภาษาและภาษาศาสตร์ คณะศิลปศาสตร์, มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor. PhD., Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus, Email: [nisakorn.j@psu.ac.th](mailto:nisakorn.j@psu.ac.th)

รองศาสตราจารย์ ดร. อาจารย์ภาควิชาภาษาและภาษาศาสตร์ คณะศิลปศาสตร์, มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่

these learners were moderate ELLSs users and the high achievers used more ELLSs than their counterparts. Both the Muslim and the non-Muslim high achievers used indirect strategies more than the direct ones and no significant differences were found. Both used metacognitive the most; however; memory and social strategies were used significantly more by the Muslim than the non-Muslim high achievers. Similar results were found when comparing Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers except that the Muslim low achievers used metacognitive strategies significantly more. It can be concluded that most participants tended to develop their English language learning through indirect strategies (metacognitive, affective and social strategies) and avoid using complicated strategies. Muslim students preferred rote learning through memorization to acquire English whereas the non-Muslims applied social strategies.

**Keyword:** English Language learning strategies (ELLS), high achievers, low achievers, Muslim, non-Muslim

### **บทคัดย่อ**

การวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อเปรียบเทียบกลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษระหว่างนักเรียนที่มีภาษาแม่ต่างกัน คือ นักเรียนมุสลิมที่มีภาษาแม่เป็นภาษามลายูและนักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมที่มีภาษาแม่เป็นภาษาไทยงานวิจัยนี้ใช้วิธีการเลือกแบบเจาะจงกลุ่มตัวอย่าง คือ นักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 4 จำนวน 424 คน แบ่งเป็นนักเรียนมุสลิมที่มีคะแนนสูงจำนวน 209 คน และต่ำจำนวน 101 คน และนักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมที่มีคะแนนสูงจำนวน 59 คน และต่ำจำนวน 55 คน โดยใช้คะแนน O-NET ในวิชาภาษาอังกฤษเป็นเกณฑ์ในการแบ่ง ผู้วิจัยเก็บข้อมูลโดยใช้เครื่องมือ 2 ชนิด คือ แบบสอบถาม Strategies Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7.0 และการสัมภาษณ์กลุ่ม ผลที่ได้พบว่า นักเรียนในกลุ่มวิจัยเป็นผู้ใช้กลยุทธ์การเรียนภาษาในระดับปานกลางและ

นักเรียนที่มีคะแนนสูงทั้งสองกลุ่มใช้กลยุทธ์โดยรวมมากกว่านักเรียนที่มีคะแนนต่ำกว่า นักเรียนกลุ่มที่มีคะแนนสูงทั้งมุสลิมและที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมมีการใช้ indirect strategies มากกว่า direct strategies และไม่พบความแตกต่างของระดับการใช้ทั้งสองกลุ่มใช้ metacognitive มากที่สุดอย่างไรก็ตามกลุ่มนักเรียนมุสลิมที่มีคะแนนสูงใช้ memory และ social strategies มากกว่ากลุ่มที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ ผลแบบเดียวกันนี้ปรากฏเมื่อเปรียบเทียบนักเรียนที่มีคะแนนต่ำระหว่างกลุ่มนักเรียนมุสลิมและที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมยกเว้นประเด็นการใช้ metacognitive ซึ่งนักเรียนมุสลิมระบุการใช้มากกว่าอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ จากผลการวิจัยอาจกล่าวได้ว่านักเรียนทั้งหมดมีแนวโน้มที่จะใช้ indirect strategies (metacognitive, affective, social strategies) และหลีกเลี่ยงการใช้กลยุทธ์ที่ซับซ้อนนักเรียนมุสลิมใช้กลยุทธ์แบบท่องจำ ในการเรียนรู้ภาษา ในขณะที่นักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิมมักใช้ social strategy.

**คำสำคัญ:** กลวิธีการเรียนภาษาอังกฤษ, ผู้มีความสามารถสูง, ผู้มีความสามารถต่ำ, นักเรียนมุสลิม, นักเรียนที่ไม่ใช่มุสลิม

## Introduction

Over the last few decades, a massive number of researches in the field of second language acquisition have significantly shifted. Greater attention has been paid to learners and learning rather than teachers and teaching (Wenden and Rubin, 1987; Yabukoshi and Takeuchi, 2009; Nikoopour and Farsani, 2010), simultaneously with appealing on distinguishing successful and unsuccessful learners; what good learners do to help themselves learn language better and what their counterparts lack (Wharton, 2000). As a result, language learning strategies issues have turned out to be one of the most preferable issues in research discipline that have contributed to language learning (MacIntyre, 1994).

To be specific, strategies refer to the techniques used by learners to make learning easier, faster, more productive and more self-directed (Oxford, 1990). Some examples are remembering and retrieving information, guessing for meaning and using gestures to bridge the gap in communication, interacting with others using English as a

mean of communication, and dealing with emotions, as well as; relaxing before speaking English. They also refer to the way students manage and schedule the learning of language inside and outside the classroom.

Revealed by extensive studies, it has been found that language learning strategies have a significant impact on students' second language competencies, because the more students used strategies, the more advanced they became (Hong-Nam and Leavell, 2006). Yet, not all of the learners favored strategies in the same fashion. For example, among those strategies classified by Oxford (1990), having been cultivated with rote learning, Chinese students were found to employ memory and compensation strategies (Quiguan, Chatupote, and Teo, 2008) and due to social sensitivity, Iranian female students used social strategies the least (Khalil, 2005). However, differences in employing language learning strategies lied on many variables. Learning style, proficiency level, nationality, gender, ethnicity or language background have been found to be possible variables that can impact the choice of using LLSs (Oxford and Burry-Stock, 1995; Green and Oxfröd, 1995; Park, 1997; Wharton, 2000; Gan, Humphreys, and Hamp-Lyons, 2004).

Apart from those previous variables, ethnicity which refers to mother tongue or language background (Grainger, 1997) has also been found to be an impact which can influence or have an effect on learners' use of language learning strategies. For example, according to Grainger (1997), European students with more proficiency and background knowledge relating to English preferred to use social strategies while Asian background students preferred to employ compensation strategies due to the lack of English competencies. Furthermore, in the Arabian context, the findings were inconsistent (Khalil, 2005; Gerami & Baighlou, 2011). For instance, it is found that even though female students had limited opportunities to socialize, they surpassed male students in employing overall language learning strategies due to better and more effective planning and managing (Khalil, 2005). The work of Abu Shmais (2004) showed that males and females Palestinian university students used overall language learning strategies at a moderate level reflecting the moderate degree of awareness towards

English study at University. The inconsistencies of those research findings have led to a call for more research to replicate.

Although language learning strategies have long been researched, an extensive amount is conducted in other contexts leaving the EFL context open for more exploration and investigation (Gan et al., 2004). Thus, this study aimed to investigate these groups of Muslim students who have Melayu language as their mother tongue and Non-Muslim students who possess Thai as their mother tongue to explore their perceptions and to compare their English language learning strategies in order to understand whether they share common strategies or use different ones which can later be taken as a guideline in the learning and teaching of English for this particular context.

### **Research Questions**

1. What kinds of English language learning strategies do Muslim high and low achievers employ? Are there any significant differences between the two types of students?
2. What kinds of English language learning strategies do non-Muslim high and low achievers employ? Are there any significant differences between the two types of students?
3. Are there any significant differences between Muslim and non-Muslim high and low achievers in their use of English language learning strategies?

### **Methodology**

#### **Setting and Participants**

The study employed purposive sampling to examine the participants whose characteristics matched the target group the study aimed to investigate. Two schools, categorized as large-sized schools, were chosen to represent Muslim and non-Muslim students: Darussalam School, a private religious school representing Muslim high and low achievers; and Narathiwat School, a public school representing non-Muslim high and low achievers.

However, based on Hughes' (1989) stratification formula, only those learners whose English scores in O-NET (Ordinary National Educational Test) were at the top and bottom 27% were qualified. Those at the top 27% were considered as high achievers and those at the bottom 27% were considered as low achievers.

Therefore, out of a population of 733, there were 310 Muslim participants (209 high achievers and 101 low achievers) and 114 non-Muslim students (59 high achievers and 55 low achievers).

#### Instrumentation

To investigate the language learning strategies used, the researcher adapted a self-reported five-point likert scale, Strategy Inventory for Language Learning version 7.0 (SILL) invented in 1990 by Oxford (1990). The SILL questionnaire is comprised of 50 items aiming to discover six dimensions of language learning strategies. *First*, memory strategies help learners to remember and retrieve new information. *Second*, cognitive strategies help learners to link between new and existing knowledge. *Third*, compensation strategies help learners to use language despite their knowledge limitation. *Fourth*, metacognitive strategies refer to techniques learners use to organize, plan and monitor their learning. *Fifth*, affective strategies refer to how learners control their emotions, attitudes, and motivations when they learn language. *Sixth*, social strategies refer to interactions with others.

The adapted SILL questionnaire was translated into Thai and submitted to three experts to examine its content validity based on IOC or Index of *Item-Objective Congruence* (Rovinelli & Hambleton, 1976) which later revealed the highest (1.00) score of validity. Then the questionnaire was tried out to test its reliability with 40 students. The reliability of the questionnaire used in the study gained Cronbach's Alpha at 0.9 which can be considered as a high degree (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995).

The other instrument was a guided interview form. The interview session included 12 questions related to the previous six strategies. For example, "what do you do to memorize new words or phrases?", "How do you practice you skills; reading,



writing, listening, and speaking?”, “Do you spend sometimes outside of the classroom to study English?”, and “What is your attitude to learning English? Have you ever told anyone how you feel about learning English?” Its content validity was checked by the three experts.

#### Data Collection and analysis

For data collection, the SILL was distributed to all 917 students in both schools. The questionnaire was explicitly explained by the researcher and the students' supervisors. Later, with their supervisors, they were checked when they were returned. Data from the questionnaires and interviews were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

To analyze data from the questionnaire, the study adopted descriptive analysis as the statistical devices in order to find Mean scores, Standard Deviation and Independent t-test to indicate whether there were any significant differences among participants of both groups. Data from interviews were categorized and summarized.

While data from the interview session were interpreted qualitatively as a way of supporting the quantitative data from the questionnaire, the questionnaire results were interpreted based on Oxford (1990). The following intervals were employed to interpret the mean score in the questionnaires:

- The mean score between 1.00-1.49 meant the least frequently used
- The mean score between 1.50-2.49 meant rarely used
- The mean score between 2.50-3.49 meant moderately used
- The mean score between 3.50-4.49 meant frequently used
- The mean score between 4.50-.5.00 meant the most frequently used

## Results

### 1. Strategies Used by Muslim High and Low Achievers

Table 1 shows that both types of scorers fell only into the moderate level of overall strategies users. However, having scrutinized deeper, Muslim high achievers used overall strategies more significantly (HMx=3.03, LMx=2.77). When the use of direct

and indirect strategies were compared, they both mutually fell into the moderate use range of both strategy types. Both groups reported of using indirect strategies (*strategies that help students learn language indirectly*) more often than direct strategies (*strategies which contribute directly to language learning - deep processing*). As indicated, the high achievement students significantly outpaced their counterparts in the frequency use of both strategies.

Exploring deeper into specific strategies, all were found falling under moderately used. For the most used strategies, both groups employed metacognitive (HMx=3.46, LMx=3.13) and affective (HMx=3.07, LMx=2.77) strategies as the top ones (*e.g. finding out how to be a better learner of English and encouraging speaking English despite being afraid of making mistakes*). Again, the Muslim high achievers used them more significantly. Nevertheless only 4 students in the interview were afraid of making mistakes in speaking activities.

Regarding the most and least used strategies, it was found that cognitive (HMx=2.97, LMx=2.66) were among top strategies used by the high and low scorers respectively (*e.g. using an English word in different ways and reviewing English lessons*) and compensation strategies (*e.g. using gesture*) were ranked among the least used by Muslim students in both groups (HMx=2.93, LMx=2.66). Even though both used these strategies moderately, it was again employed more significantly by the high achievers and claimed by students in the interview session of lacking situation where this strategy could be applied. For social and memory strategies, it was found that these were used less by both groups and with no statistical differences.

Memory strategies, ranging from using flash cards, reviewing English lessons before and after classes, memorizing new English vocabulary and sentences were reported in the open-ended questions and interviews as frequently used by both groups of these Muslim students. In addition, listening to English music, watching soundtrack movies and English videos on Youtube were among the most interesting activities reported by Muslim learners in interview session.

Table 1

Language Learning Strategies		H-Muslim		L-Muslim		t	sig(2-tailed)
		(n=209)		(n=101)			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Strategies	Direct	2.93	0.66	2.69	0.58	3.11	0.00
	Indirect	3.15	0.76	2.89	0.58	3.16	0.00
Direct	Memory	2.88	0.70	2.73	0.60	1.80	0.07
	Cognitive	2.97	0.71	2.66	0.64	3.48	0.00
	Compensation	2.93	0.72	2.66	0.63	3.09	0.00
Indirect	Metacognitive	3.46	0.87	3.13	0.68	3.43	0.00
	Affective	3.07	0.75	2.77	0.65	3.27	0.00
	Social	2.78	0.86	2.66	0.74	1.25	0.21
TOTAL		3.03	0.68	2.77	0.54	3.37	0.00

## 2. Strategies Used by non-Muslim High and Low Achievers

As indicated in Table 2, non-Muslim high achievers used overall strategies significantly more than the low achievers, yet based on the mean score both groups were reported to be mutually moderate users of overall strategies used ( $HNM\bar{x}=2.97$ ,  $LN\bar{M}x=2.57$ ). Although both applied indirect strategies more than direct strategies, they were used significantly more by the high achievers. Moreover, while scrutinizing specific strategies, the three strategies claimed to be used significantly more by non-Muslim high achievers were metacognitive, social and cognitive (*e.g. paying attention to English speaking, asking questions and reading in English*) ( $P<0.02$ ).

Regarding the frequency use of strategies, all strategies were grouped in a moderate use range, except cognitive that fell into the rarely used range, as indicated by low achievement students ( $LN\bar{M}x=2.41$ ).

Both similarly prioritized in using metacognitive strategies (*e.g. paying attention to someone speaking English*) to facilitate language learning and were moderate users

of this strategy. Yet again the high achievers employed it more significantly ( $HNM\bar{x} = 3.27$ ,  $LN\bar{x} = 2.72$ ).

Apart from metacognitive strategies, cognitive and social were among top strategies used significantly more by non-Muslim high achievers even though they were moderately used. However, it is noticeable that the low achievers rarely used either strategy. The top strategies among non-Muslim low achievers were memory and affective strategies even though they were used moderately.

Similarly to Muslim students, surfing the Internet to read current news in simple English regarding gadgets, sports and movie stars; accessing English videos on Youtube to learn English; listening to English songs; and spending leisure for watching soundtrack movies were favorite activities reported by non-Muslim students in open-ended questions and the interviews.

Table 2

Language Learning Strategies		H-NonMuslim		L-NonMuslim		t	sig (2-tailed)
		(n=59)		(n=55)			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Strategies	Direct	2.92	0.45	2.52	0.42	4.87	0.00
	Indirect	3.05	0.59	2.63	0.57	3.87	0.00
	Memory	2.64	0.53	2.66	0.56	0.16	0.88
Direct	Cognitive	3.17	0.65	2.41	0.56	6.64	0.00
	Compensation	2.75	0.74	2.56	0.56	1.54	0.13
	Metacognitive	3.27	0.82	2.72	0.72	3.85	0.00
Indirect	Affective	2.77	0.66	2.59	0.65	1.47	0.14
	Social	3.01	0.71	2.55	0.70	3.47	0.00
Total		2.97	0.46	2.57	0.41	4.99	0.00

### 3. Comparison of Strategies Used between Muslim and Non-Muslim High Achievers

As shown in table 3, both groups of high achievers shared various similarities and utilized differences of language learning strategies. Equivalent to the Muslim high achievers, non-Muslim ones also used overall strategies moderately ( $HM\bar{x}=3.30$ ,

HNM $\bar{x}$ =2.97). They mutually used indirect strategies more than direct ones. However, there were no significant differences between the two groups regarding the frequency in using either direct or indirect strategies. It was also found that only memory and affective strategies were used more significantly by Muslim high achievers.

To enhance language learning, high performers utilized metacognitive strategies more frequently than other strategies (*e.g. paying attention to someone speaking English*). Nevertheless, both Muslim and non-Muslim performers fell into the moderate user category of this strategy (HM $\bar{x}$  = 3.46, HNM $\bar{x}$  = 3.27). To further compare, other strategies found moderately used in both groups also produced no statistically significant differences except for memory and affective strategies. Each of these was used more by the Muslim high achievers than the non-Muslim ones.

Apart from metacognitive and cognitive strategies (*e.g. finding out how to be a good English learner and practicing the sound of English*), affective and social strategies (*trying to relax to overcome fear of using English and asking people to repeat or slow down if they do not understand*) appeared among top strategies used by Muslim and non-Muslims alike. Furthermore, compensation and memory strategies were found to be among the least used strategies (*e.g. acting out to remember words and making up new words*) by high score learners.

Table 3

Language Learning Strategies		H-Muslim		H-NonMuslim		t	sig (2-tailed)
		(n=209)		(n=59)			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Strategies	Direct	2.93	0.66	2.92	0.45	0.19	0.85
	Indirect	3.15	0.76	3.05	0.59	1.03	0.31
	Memory	2.88	0.70	2.64	0.53	2.74	0.01
Direct	Cognitive	2.97	0.71	3.17	0.65	1.91	0.06
	Compensation	2.93	0.72	2.75	0.74	1.66	0.10
	Metacognitive	3.46	0.87	3.27	0.82	1.42	0.16
Indirect	Affective	3.07	0.75	2.77	0.66	2.71	0.01
	Social	2.78	0.86	3.01	0.71	1.83	0.07
Total		3.30	0.68	2.97	0.46	0.63	0.53

#### 4. Comparison of strategies used between Muslim and non-Muslim Low Achievers

Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers were known to use overall strategies lower than the high achievers as shown in tables 1 and 2. Yet, as indicated in table 4, comparing the overall use of strategies of the low scorers from these two groups, fell into the moderate use range ( $LM\bar{x}=2.77$ ,  $LN\bar{M}\bar{x}=2.57$ ); however, the group used them more significantly.

It could be reported that both attempted indirect more than direct strategies; however, Muslim students used indirect strategies more significantly ( $LM\bar{x}=2.89$ ,  $LN\bar{M}\bar{x}=2.63$ ). Furthermore, Muslim students used each individual strategy at the moderate level while non-Muslim students rarely used cognitive.

To learn English, both groups prioritized metacognitive, affective and memory strategies over the others (*e.g. finding out a better way to be a good English learner, remembering new words by imaging situations in which they can be used, and overcoming the fear when using English*). However, only metacognitive and cognitive strategies were reported to be used significantly differently between the two groups ( $P<0.02$ ).

Table 4

Language Learning Strategies		L-Muslim		L-NonMuslim		t	sig (2-tailed)
		(n=101)		(n=55)			
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Strategies	Direct	2.69	0.58	2.52	0.42	1.89	0.06
	Indirect	2.89	0.58	2.63	0.57	2.71	0.01
Direct	Memory	2.73	0.60	2.66	0.56	0.75	0.45
	Cognitive	2.66	0.64	2.41	0.56	2.46	0.02
	Compensation	2.66	0.63	2.56	0.56	1.05	0.30
Indirect	Metacognitive	3.13	0.68	2.72	0.72	3.60	0.00
	Affective	2.77	0.65	2.59	0.65	1.69	0.09

Social	2.66	0.74	2.55	0.70	0.88	0.38
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>0.41</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>0.01</b>

## Summary of the results and discussion

### 1. Strategies Used by Muslim High and Low Achievers

The study offers a pattern of English language learning strategies used by Muslim high and low achievers. The results revealed that the former group utilized overall strategies significantly more often than the latter group. It can be implied that the more proficiency the language learners possessed, the more strategies they tended to employ as was found in Hong-Nam and Leavell (2006), and that the more advanced student were, the more techniques were available for them to use.

Another implication is that the results for both groups indicated the level of learners' awareness of using strategies, even though the high scorers showed more awareness as it was found that not only overall strategies but also direct and indirect strategies were reported to be of high frequency use among high scorers. This result is consistent with many prominent studies. For example, Qingquan et al. (2008) investigated language learning strategies among first year Chinese students in a university in China and found that successful learners employed direct and indirect strategies more often than the unsuccessful ones. Rubin (1975) also found that successful students utilized a wider range of strategies in language learning compared with unsuccessful students. Grainger (1997) found different strategies used by different ethnicities. While learners with Asian background tended to guess meaning, those with European and English-speaking background prioritized in using dictionaries and scheduling language learning.

Scrutinizing specific strategies use, Muslim students were found utilizing both similar and different strategies. Metacognitive and affective strategies appeared to be popular among these two groups of learners. Both strategies were mutually grouped in indirect strategies relating to managing, evaluating, monitoring, and dealing with

unstable emotions. It indicated that students were aware of strategies in promoting language understanding indirectly - not only memorizing, creating structure, or guessing intelligently but also by paying attention to English speaking, finding ways to improve competencies, and looking for opportunities to use English. Another implication was English was dominant in English class, it encouraged students to practice English both inside and outside. Students studied before moving to high school, in the middle of this transition, they had to be more alert in strategies they used both consciously and unconsciously.

Social strategies were found to be the least used strategies among these students, although they were in the moderate use range. It depicted the limitation of interaction with those whose English is the medium of conversation. Based on the interviews, students were afraid of speaking English with their friends fearing that their friends may laugh or make fun of them if they made mistakes. This aroused students in turning to use affective strategies to produce motivation in speaking English. In addition, to explain the lack of social strategy, claimed by a study conducted in Kuwait (El-Dib, 2004) concerning Islamic contexts in which gender sensitivity plays an important role in society, females have more limited opportunity than males to socialize with others due to religious demand. However, it also might be implied with the lack of opportunities to practice social strategies outside the classroom setting. Social strategies require spoken language, such as, asking for more information, help, and clarification. For these students to socialize with people in English and to practice their language outside the classroom seems to be limited.

## 2. Strategies Used by non-Muslim High and Low Achievers

Non-Muslim high performers were found to use English language learning strategies more often than their counterparts. The former were moderate strategy users and the latter rarely used them. The assumption might be similar to those discussed in the previous section that the more proficiency, the more strategies students tend to employ. To further illustrate this point, Griffiths (2003) stated that the more advanced the proficiency of the students, the more strategies they tended to utilize in language



learning. Furthermore, these high achievement students have shown the characteristics of being active participants responsible for their own learning, as indicated by the degree of higher strategies they used as opposed to the low achievement students.

Looking at specific strategies, the non-Muslim students employed metacognitive strategies more than other strategies and as much as the Muslim students. However, the important factor that contributed to the different outcome of the study might be explained by the frequency or the density in applying this strategy, which high achievement students used at a higher frequency.

Compared with their counterparts, the non-Muslim high achievers did not have to rely much on rote learning, which was considered a basic way of learning because of the background knowledge of English they already had or had accumulatively learnt and understood. For example, to recognize the word “unhelpful”, the high achievers might have only glanced at it and known what it meant by using their high cognitive strategies to break it into prefix ‘un’, ‘help’, and suffix ‘ful’, but for the low cognitive strategies students, remembering left only a choice.

The non-Muslim high achievement students used social more than affective strategies, while the low achievers used affective more than social strategies. Since the high achievers had more proficiency in language learning, it helped to be able to apply more social strategies when encountering even unexpected situations, while the low achievers had to overcome the fear of producing mistakes and they needed to ponder on the compensation strategies.

### 3. Similarities and Differences in Employing English Language Learning Strategies among Muslim and Non-Muslim High and Low Achievement Students

Most participants in the study, in order to develop their English language learning, were reported as adopting and prioritizing metacognitive strategies ranging from finding opportunities to use English, noticing mistakes to improve them, organizing and scheduling time for practicing, monitoring their own language learning development, and evaluating language learning process. The result is consistent with the study conducted by Saiyarin (2011). She found that students initially utilized

metacognitive strategies. Unlike cognitive, compensation, and memory strategies, metacognitive strategy is not at a deep-level of L2 competencies, so it might be another assumption to propose why most students employed this strategy at a high level of frequency compared with others strategies.

The least favored strategies among the low achievement participants were cognitive strategies. A the study conducted in Gaza (Abu Shmais, 2004), both groups of low performers were similarly found to hardly ever apply cognitive strategies in language learning, as oppose to the high achievement learners who applied them more frequently. To perform cognitive strategies compared to metacognitive, requires deeper levels of competency. It is a deep strategy (Leaver, Ehrman, & Shekhtman, 2005) referring to relating new information to already existing knowledge. Some examples are speaking or writing in English, trying to imitate native speakers of English, avoiding translation to L1, using words in different ways, and writing notes in English. All of these specific strategies need students' proficiency to some extent and since the high achievers possess a higher level of English competency, they can use cognitive strategies more comfortably.

Memory strategies were utilized by Muslim more than non-Muslim students. Since English was the third and second language to Muslim and non-Muslim learners respectively, acquiring new languages through memorization, ranging from remembering new words and sentences, using flashcards, and reviewing English lessons seemed to be easier than other strategies. Muslim students employed this strategy because it required only the effort to memorize and needed a smaller range of English knowledge compared to cognitive and compensation strategies. To employ certain strategies as a short cut to embrace English as a third language and at a surface level of knowledge, Muslim students seemed to rely more on memory strategies than non-Muslim learners did.

Furthermore, non-Muslim high achievers used social strategies more. It can be explained by the sensitivity in religious demand because of which Muslim students,

especially females, had limitations in socializing with others (El-Dib, 2004), thus they may have become more reserved than the non-Muslim high achievers.

### **Implications of the study**

Due to the fact that strategies can be transferable from teachers to students and students to students (Griffiths & Parr, 2001), the suggested implications will be related to classroom study. *First is explicit instruction.* Since it was found that learners from different ethnicities or with different mother tongue employ different strategies, teachers should provide learners with a set of strategies for them to practice which should be one way to raise strategy' awareness. In other words, the activities, assignments and lessons should encourage students to use strategies that they normally use and some that they never used before both in class and outside the classroom. *Second is strategies reflection.* Teacher may conduct a self-report questionnaire to elicit learners' strategies based on their perceptions, and have them share and discuss how they used those strategies to accomplish the task or practice English with other learners. *Third, the emphasis should be on low achiever students.* Both Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers used strategies less than their counterparts, thus teacher's modeling and evaluations are vital. *Fourth is the provision of a wide range of activities related to students' preferences.* Obviously, Muslim and non-Muslim students are interested in learning English by listening to music, watching films and videos from the Internet, so, the selection of relevant form or content of materials to suit learners' interest might be worth trying.

### **Limitations**

The present study aimed to offer some evidence of the use of language learning strategies in six dimensions by Muslim and non-Muslim students living in the same environment (Narathiwat province) to see if the aspect of ethnicity or mother tongue difference may have contributed to the different use of strategies. This study employed only purposive sampling based on characteristics of students. In addition, this study used only SILL and access strategies in language learning merely through self-reported questionnaires and interviews. Therefore, it is suggested that using a combination of

methods as well as applying qualitative and quantitative formulas (Grainger, 1997) and replication should be encouraged.

## References

- Abu Shmais, W. (2004). The English Language Learning Strategies of An-Najah National University EFL Majors. Retrieved from <http://repository.yu.edu.jo:80/handle/123456789/530264>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: construction, administration, and processing* (2 nd ed.). New York, NY: Rutledge.
- El-Dib, M. A. B. (2004). Language Learning Strategies in Kuwait: Links to Gender, Language Level, and Culture in a Hybrid Context. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(1), 85–95. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02176.x
- Gan, Z., Humphreys, G., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2004). Understanding Successful and Unsuccessful EFL Students in Chinese Universities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(2), 229–244. doi:10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00227.x
- Gerami, M. H., & Baighlou, S. M. G. (2011). Language Learning Strategies Used by Successful and Unsuccessful Iranian EFL Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1567–1576. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.399

- Grainger, P. R. (1997). Language-Learning Strategies for Learners of Japanese: Investigating Ethnicity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(3), 378–385. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1997.tb02360.x
- Green, J. M., & Oxford, R. (1995). A Closer Look at Learning Strategies, L2 Proficiency, and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 261–297. doi:10.2307/3587625
- Griffiths, C. (2003). Patterns of language learning strategy use. *System*, 31(3), 367–383. doi:10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00048-4
- Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language-learning strategies: theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 247–254. doi:10.1093/elt/55.3.247
- Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2006). Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an intensive English learning context. *System*, 34(3), 399–415. doi:10.1016/j.system.2006.02.002
- Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khalil, A. (2005). Assessment of Language Learning Strategies Used by Palestinian EFL Learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(1), 108–117. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02458.x
- Leaver, B. L., Ehrman, M. E., & Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving success in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1994). *Toward a Social Psychological Model of Strategy Use*.

*Foreign Language Annals*, 27(2), 185–195. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1994.tb01201.x

Nikoopour, J., & Amini Farsani, M. (2010). On the relationship between language learning strategies and personality types among Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of English Students*, 1(1), 81-101.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1–23.  
doi:10.1016/0346-251X(94)00047-A

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

Park, G.-P. (1997). Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency in Korean University Students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(2), 211–221.  
doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1997.tb02343.x

Qingquan, N., Chatupote, M., & Teo, A. (2008). A Deep Look into Learning Strategy Use by Successful and Unsuccessful Students in the Chinese EFL Learning Context. *RELC Journal*, 39(3), 338–358.  
doi:10.1177/0033688208096845

Rovinelli, R. J., & Hambleton, R. K. (1977). On the Use of Content Specialists in the Assessment of Criterion-Referenced Test Item Validity. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED121845>

Rubin, J. (1975). What the “Good Language Learner” Can Teach Us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41. doi:10.2307/3586011

Saiyarin, R (2011). Language Learning Strategies used by Students at Different Proficiency Levels (Unpublished minor thesis). Prince of Songkhla University.

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (eds). (1987). *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language Learning Strategy Use of Bilingual Foreign Language Learners in Singapore. *Language Learning*, 50(2), 203–243. doi:10.1111/0023-8333.00117

Yabukoshi, T., & Takeuchi, O. (2009). Language learning strategies used by lower secondary school learners in a Japanese EFL context<sup>1</sup>. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 136–172. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00221.x

#### Language learning strategies (Oxford, 1990)

	Language Learning Strategy	
Memory	1	I think of relationships between what I already know and new things that I learn in English.
	2	I use new English words in a sentence so I can remember them.
	3	I connect the sound of a new English word and a picture of the word to help me

		remember the word.
	4	I remember a new English word by imagining a situation in which the word might be used.
	5	I use similar sounds to remember new English word. For example, “believe” and “receive” have the same sound, so I put them in the same group
	6	I use flashcards to remember new English words.
	7	I physically act out new English words.
	8	I review English lessons often.
	9	I remember new English words or phrases by remembering their location, for example, on the page, on the board, or on a street sign.
Cognitive	10	I say or write new English words many times.
	11	I try to talk like native English speakers.
	12	I practice the sounds of English.
	13	I use the English words I know in different ways.
	14	I start conversations in English.
	15	I watch movies with English soundtrack.
	16	I read for pleasure in English.
	17	I write notes in English.
	18	I first skim an English passage (read over the passage quickly) then go back and read carefully again.
	19	I look for words in my own language that are similar to new words in English.
	20	I study English sentences structure in order to get the language patterns to be used later.



	21	I find the meaning of English words by dividing it into parts that I can understand.
	22	I try not to translate word-for-word.
	23	I make summaries of information that I hear or read in English.
Compensation	24	To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.
	25	When I can't think of a word during a conversation in English, I use gesture.
	26	I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.
	27	I read English without looking up every new word.
	28	I try to guess what the other person will say next in English.
	29	If I can't think of an English word, I use a word or phrase that means the same thing.
Metacognitive	30	I try to find chances that I can to use English.
	31	I notice my English mistakes and use it to help me do better.
	32	I pay attention when someone is speaking English.
	33	I try to find out how to be a better learner of English.
	34	I organize my timetable so I will have enough time to study English.
	35	I look for people I can talk to in English.
	36	I look for opportunities to read as much as possible in English.
	37	I have clear goals for improving my English skills, for example, listening and speaking skills.
	38	I think about my progress in learning English.
Affective	39	I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.
	40	I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake.

	41	I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.
	42	I notice if I am tense or nervous when I am studying or using English.
	43	I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.
	44	I talk to someone else about how I feel when I am learning English.
Social	45	If I do not understand something in English, I ask the other person to slow down or say it again.
	46	I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk.
	47	I practice English with other students.
	48	I ask for help from English speakers.
	49	I ask questions in English.
	50	I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.

## Interview question

General	4. How long have you been studying English?
Memory	5. What do you do to memorize new words or phrases?
	6. How often you review your lesson? And is it often occurred before or after class? do you think it works?
Cognitive	7. How do you practice you skills; reading, writing, listening, and speaking?
Compensation	8. What would you do if you found a problem of understanding while speaking and listening? Have you ever experienced it before? What do you do to solve the problem?
	9. What would you do if you found a problem of understanding while reading and writing?
Metacognitive	10. Do you spend some time outside the classroom to study English? Why (not)? and how?
	11. Do you wish to improve your English? How do you expect to do it?

Affective	12. What is your attitude towards learning English? Have you ever told anyone how you feel about English?
	13. Do you like studying English? Do you study it because you love it or you think knowing English will get you a good job? What are your reasons?
	14. What do you do if you get stressed when studying English?
Social	15. How do you feel about speaking English in classroom with teacher, friends, and in front of the classroom? Why?
	16. Do you like to practice English with others or on your own? Why?

## **PAPER 2**

### **Personality Traits: A Comparison Study of Muslim and Non-Muslim Students**

## **Personality Traits: A Comparison Study of Muslim and Non-Muslim Students**

*Munir Laeha<sup>3</sup>*

*Nisakorn Charumanee<sup>4</sup>*

### **Abstract**

The study aimed to investigate personality traits specifically to extroversion and introversion dimensions. Using purposive sampling, the participants of the study consisted of 372 Matthayomsuksa 4 students: 268 Muslim and 114 non-Muslim learners from two large-sized schools in Narathiwat. Participants were divided into high and low achievement learners by using O-NET scores for English (167 Muslim high and 101 achievers, and 59 non-Muslim high and 55 low achievers). The study employed two instruments:

---

<sup>3</sup> M.A. Student in Teaching English as an International Language Program, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkhla University, Hatyai, Thailand, Email: munir\_leaha@yahoo.com

<sup>4</sup> *Corresponding author. Ph. D., Assoc. Prof.* of English languages and linguistics, Department of Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkhla University, Hatyai, Thailand, Email: nisakorn.j@psu.ac.th

the modified personality traits questionnaire and a guided interview. Means, standard deviations and t-test were used as statistical devices. Quenk's (2009) dichotomy was adapted for the interpretation. The result indicated that Muslim high achievers were clearly introvert, while the Muslim low achievers were clearly extrovert. For non-Muslim students, both the high and low achievers were clear and very clear extrovert respectively.

**Keywords:** personality traits, extroversion, introversion, high and low achievers.

### **Introduction**

Since the mid-1960s, the massive amount of language research has emphasized investigating language learning success. Researchers explored what prospects make a good language learner and what makes him/her a better learner. Many researchers draw an assumption that inner learners' individual variations, such as personality traits, are among prominent elements pushing students to be successful. Personality traits refer to inner unique aspects of behaviors as Richards, Platt and Platt (1998 cited in Deweale & Furham, 1999) defined personality traits as *"those aspects of an individual's behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, thoughts, actions, and feelings which are seen as typical and distinctive of that person and recognized by that person and others"*.

The major personality traits specifically extroversion and introversion, perform an integral part in language learning (Brown 2000) and are not only important for acquiring L1 but also L2 (Deweale & Furham, 1999) Yet a common assumption has been made among scholars that the extrovert type of personality trait might reach a greater degree of success in second language learning than the introvert type (Kezwer 1987; Saville-Troike 2006; Wong, 2011). To be more emphatic on the essence of personality, a relationship has been found between personality and language outcomes. For example, consuming seven years in observing the prediction of personality towards academic performance of medical students in Belgium, Livens, Ones, and Dilchert (2009) found that extroversion relating to openness and consciousness were reported to positively predict the grade point average of the students. Relevant to a study by Paunonen

and Ashton (2001), correlations were found between extroversion and academic performance.

Specifically on extroversion-introversion, an extrovert normally communicates without inhibition, which is convincing enough to attract a teacher to believe in the notion that he or she is better and more successful in language learning. For example, Naimen, Frohlich, and Stern (1975, cited in Busch (1982) carried out an observation research in classroom study. They found that a certain type of extrovert personality trait such as raising the hand for asking questions correlated with the positive outcome of language proficiency. Students who had done a lot of speaking in the class gained higher scores in a test. Proposed by Rubin (1975), certain extroversion personality types such as intensive desire and motivation to seek for opportunities to communicate might be one indicator to categorize a good language learner. However, in an EFL context such as Japan, Carrell, Prince, and Astika (1996) found positive correlation between extroversion/introversion personality traits and vocabulary learning. The former type appeared to gain higher scores in the vocabulary examination than the latter. However, what they found seemed to be inconsistent with what was found in the western context. Introversion gained higher proficiency scores than their counterparts. Therefore, to conclude that extroversion is better is too extreme.

In the Arabian context, where Muslim culture is prevalent, there is the scarcity of studies in connection with extroversion and introversion personality types. Some studies already claimed that based on religious demands in Islamic cultures people tended to prefer introversion and taught their children to be the kind of person who could be identified as introverted. Islam is regarded as being conservative, and gender sensitivity appears to be an important element shaping the characteristic of Muslim students. For example, in such a conservative society, females might not have opportunities as much as males to socialize with people (El-Dib 2004). In Thailand, the same conservative characteristic was reported in a study relating to Muslim students' attitude towards English

language study in Yala province where the majority of the population is Muslim (Rattanyart, 2007). Yet the study did not aim to explore their personality traits as successful and unsuccessful students.

In spite of the growing attention to extroversion and introversion personality traits, attention has been scant to compare if the high and low achievement students from two different ethnic groups, specifically Muslim and non-Muslim secondary students, displayed similar or different personalities. The aim of the current study was to examine the personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim learners by attempting to answer the following research questions.

### **Research Questions**

1. What kinds of personality trait do the high and low achievement Muslim students have? Are there any significant differences between the two types of students?
2. What kinds of personality trait do high and low achievement non-Muslim students have? Are there any significant differences between the two types of students?
3. Are there any significant differences between high and low achievement Muslim and non-Muslim students in terms of their personality traits they have?

### **Methodology**

#### **Setting and Participants**

Purposive sampling was used to qualify students due to the unique characteristic of their mother tongue. Two schools, categorized as large sized schools having students exceeding 4,000 were picked to represent Muslim and non-Muslim students or Melayu-speaking and Thai-speaking students: Darussalam school representing Muslim/Melayu-speaking students and Narathiwat school representing non-Muslim/Thai-speaking students.

To stratify the participants, the study employed English scores from 2014 O-NET (Ordinary National Educational test) as a central core of score

measurement before categorizing students as high and low scorers. Based on Hughes's twenty-seven percent technique, only those scorers within the top 27% and bottom 27% in each school were targeted for investigation as high and low achievement students, respectively.

As a consequence, from the population of 733, there were 268 Malayu-speaking students divided into 167 high and 101 low achievers, and 114 Thai-speaking students divided into 59 high and 55 low achievers who could participate in the study.

### **Instrumentations**

To investigate what types of personality students displayed, this study employed two instruments: 1) modified Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) questionnaire, 2) guided interview questions.

MBTI consists of four dimensions which are described below:

#### *1) Extroversion and Introversion (E-I):*

Extroverts are easily let the people and things come in. They seem to be impulsive in making decisions. In the classroom setting, they are more comfortable with pair and group activities and normally seek opportunities to get to know people in non-classroom situations. They are seen to be outgoing and have a large number of friends. In addition, they tend to actively communicate through speaking more than writing.

Introverts are said to be very focused on their inner world. They seem to be more interested and motivated when they work quietly without interruption. In the classroom, they tend to keep quiet and most of the time they say no words. In making decision, they normally need time to process before reaching conclusions. They are understood to be shy.

#### *2) Sensing and Intuitive (S-I):*

In searching for information, sensing tends to be gained through physical reality, seeing, hearing, touching, tasting, and



smelling. Such students are concerned the most about facts and explanations and like to remember details that seem to be important to them.

The intuitive tend to be drawn by abstract meaning, relationships, theoretical aspects, and possibilities about events. When remembering something, they are interested in memorizing them in the bigger picture more than from actual facts and details.

### *3) Thinking and Feeling (T-F):*

The different characteristics of the thinking and feeling tend to depend on the situation when they have to make a decision. The thinking tend to conclude their decisions through logical explanations, principles, and cause and effect. In classroom settings when they are with friends, they tend to avoid all conflicts even in a normal debate.

The feeling tend to make decisions based on values. The involvement of others' opinion is important to them. In addition, they will do whatever they can to assure harmony between people

### *4) Judging and Perceiving (J-P):*

The judging persons prefer to live in planned and systematic ways. They like to have things well-organized and settled. In learning, they prefer to have their exercise and homework done before going out to play with friends.

The perceiving persons tend to be more flexible. They invite new experience and information, and like to expose to them spontaneously without planning.

(Leaver, Ehrman, and Shekhtman 2005).

However, due to the aim of the current study which focused only on extroversion and introversion, only relevant questions were employed. Examples of the questions are “*Are you usually a good mixer, or rather quiet and reserved?*”, “*Among your friends are you full of news about everybody, or one of the*

*last to hear what is going on?”, “Do you tend to have broad friendships with many different people, or deep friendship with very few people?”, “When you are with the group of people, would you usually rather join in the talk of the group, or imaginative people?”*

Guided interviews, consisting of 6 questions, was applied to elicit in-depth extroversion and introversion information. Examples of interview items are “*Do you like talking to people you do not know? Why?*”, “*In the English classroom, do you like group activity or individual activity the most? Why?*”

The questionnaire and guided interview items were modified and translated into Thai. The content validity was examined and approved by three experts, while its reliability was tried out with 40 students to check whether the items conveyed the intended meanings.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

To collect the data, the questionnaire was distributed to all the target students in both schools. Working with their supervisors, the instructions were explicitly explained and the corrections were examined. When the questionnaires were accomplished, students were asked to participate in 4 group interviews which consisted of 10 students in each group: 10 Muslim high achievers, 10 Muslim low achievers, 10 non-Muslim high achievers, and 10 non-Muslim low achievers.

Data from the questionnaires and the interviews were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Descriptive statistics were employed to find means, standard deviations and independent t-test to observe any significant differences between groups of participants. Data collected from the interview sessions were summarized and used to complement data from the questionnaire.

To categorize students in a particular dimension, the interpretation followed the following intervals adapted from Quenk (2006)’s dichotomy:

The mean score between 0.01 - 2.75 means slight E-I personality

The mean score between 2.76 - 5.50 means moderate E-I personality

The mean score between 5.51 - 8.25 means clear E-I personality

The mean score between 8.26 - 11.00 means very clear E-I personality

The data from guided interviews were summarized and categorized to supplement and nourish the questionnaire data.

## Results

### *1. Personality Traits of Muslim High and Low Achievers*

As illustrated in table 1, it was found that Muslim high and low achievers fell into significantly different dichotomies of personality trait dimensions ( $P < 0.02$ ). Muslim high scorers were reported as being clearly introverted (HMx=6.90, S.D.=3.22) even though they also fell into the moderate extroversion type of personality (HMx=4.10, S.D.=3.22), while their counterparts fell clearly into the opposite side of the personality dimension, that of -being clearly extroverted (LMx=7.07, S.D.=4.00) and moderately introvert (LMx=3.93, S.D.=4.00).

Relevant data derived from interview sessions revealed that 6 out of 10 Muslim learners were reluctant to give a clear answer and put themselves in both extrovert and introvert sides. It also could be noticed that some were eager to give away their answer, while some found it more difficult to give answer. However, it was found later that those former students were extroverts with lower competencies and the latter had higher proficiency.

Personality Traits	H-Muslim (n=167)		L-Muslim (n=101)		t	sig (2- tailed)
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
	EXTRO	4.10	3.22	7.07		
INTRO	6.90	3.22	3.93	4.00	6.32	0.00

**Table 1:** *Personality traits of Muslim high and low achievers*

### *2. Personality Traits of non-Muslim High and Low Achievers*

It was found that although non-Muslim high and low scorers fell into the extroversion category (HNMx=7.00, S.D.=2.68; LNMx=8.4, S.D.=2.60), the lower proficiency students were significantly more extrovert. Furthermore, high performers perceived themselves as moderately introverted students (HNMx=4.00, S.D.=2.68) with only slight introversion (LNMx=2.51, S.D.=2.60) for the lower proficiency students.

Consistent with the data in the interview, and unlike the Muslim students, non-Muslim students were very attentive and eager to express their opinions.

Personality Traits	H-		L-		t	sig (2-tailed)
	NonMuslim (n=59)		NonMuslim (n=55)			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
EXTRO	7.00	2.68	8.49	2.0	3.01	0.00
INTRO	4.00	2.68	2.51	2.60	3.01	0.00

**Table 2:** Personality traits of non-Muslim high and low achievers

### 3. Personality Traits of Muslim High Achievers and Non-Muslim High Achievers

As indicated in table 3, it can be seen that Muslim and Non-Muslim high performers reflected different dimensions of extroversion and introversion. Their personality traits were significantly different ( $P < 0.02$ ) which can be said to have been opposite. Muslim high performers saw themselves as clear introverts (HMx=6.90, S.D.=3.22), whereas the Non-Muslim high performers considered themselves clear extroverts (HNMx=7.00, S.D.=2.68). However, the Muslim high performers were also seen as moderate extroverts while the non-Muslims behaviors were reflected as being moderate introvert.

In addition, the data derived from the questionnaire were consistent with the interview data. Most of Muslim students claimed introversion, whereas most of the non-Muslim students preferred extroversion.

Personality Traits	H-				t	sig (2- tailed)
	H-Muslim (n=167)		NonMuslim (n=59)			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
EXTRO	4.10	3.22	7.00	2.68	6.75	0.00
INTRO	6.90	3.22	4.00	2.68	6.75	0.00

**Table 3:** Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim high achievers

#### 4. Personality Traits of Muslim and non-Muslim Low Achievers

As far as the personalities of the low performers were concerned, it was found that they mutually fell into the clear and very clear extroversion range of personality (LMx=7.07, S.D.=4.00; LNMx=8.49, S.D.=2.60). However, low achievement Non-Muslim students showed a clearer picture of being extrovert learners as indicated by the degree of significant difference in Table 4. The comparison further illustrated a moderate degree of being introvert among Muslim low performers and a slight degree of that trait among the Non-Muslim low performers.

Personality Trait	L-				t	sig (2- tailed)
	L-Muslim (n=101)		NonMuslim (n=55)			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
EXTRO	7.07	4.00	8.49	2.60	2.68	0.01
INTRO	3.93	4.00	2.51	2.60	2.68	0.01

**Table 4:** Personality traits of Muslim and non-Muslim low achievers

## Summary of the Results and Discussion

### 1. The personality traits of Muslim high and low achievers

Extroversion has long been associated with success in language learning in massive amounts of investigation. The common belief is that the extroversion related to being outgoing, to openness, to easily initiating conversation might get higher proficiency in language learning achievement (Brown, 2000; Lightbown &

Spada, 2006). However, this may not have been relevant to these Muslim high performers whose introverted type of personality could be seen as being calm, quiet, enjoying solitude, and preferring space.

The interpretation may be explained in many ways. First, in language production, the introverted students tended to be more reserved, enjoying privacy. To be involved in language communication, they were usually slow to initiate conversation, but the quality and accuracy were better than that of the extroverted students. On the other hand, the extroverted learners might have produced an outcome of lower quality compared with their counterparts. This was observed in Wong's (2011) study, showing that introverted students usually accomplished higher quality homework.

The reluctance of students to give answers in interview sessions could be explained alternatively with the work of Busch (1982) conducted in Japan. Based on situational demands, Japanese students are required to show introversion. Similarly, an exhibition of introversion is expected from Muslim students who are generally brought up to be rather conservative. The results might have been too extreme for the Muslim low achievers who displayed clear extroversion. However, these lower achievers still displayed introversion to some extent.

## **2. The personality traits of non-Muslim high and low achievers**

Both groups clear and very clear extroverts who also possessed moderate and slight introvert traits. The dominant extrovert trait was clearly perceived during the interviews with these two groups. They were not reserved but were very eager to express themselves as it was found in the interview sessions. They were highly confident talking in groups especially the low achievers who seemed to be friendly and rather talkative.

However, their proficiency was different. It might be explained by the quality of their production. Based on definition proposed by Quenk and Kummerow (2001), the high achievement extrovert tended to contribute only

what they knew well, while the low achievement extrovert might have volunteered their ideas even though these were not correct or relevant.

### **3.The personality traits of Muslim and Non-Muslim students**

Due to the outcome that only Muslim high performers displayed more on introversion which contrasted to non-Muslim high performers, it may be explained as follows. First, personality traits may not tie to achievement level as both personalities were found specialized in different protocol. According to Gan (2008), both might be expert in different ways; the introverted are better written, while the extroverted seemed at ease in oral communication and some of them might do better in producing accuracy.

Second, students are from different language background, thus the background itself might play a significant role. The reservedness of Muslim society (El-Dib, 2004) and also the expected personality in some society (Busch, 1982) may-to some extent- play a role to explain the difference. The preference of introversion type in Muslim society may create a typical acceptance that being an introvert refers to proper manners and respect. Thus, it could be said that those students owned unique personality.

Muslim low performers might have the degree of extroversion more than Muslim high performers. However, the reluctance of defining themselves in interview session could reassure that these Muslim students possessed also the introversion personality to some extent.

### **Implications**

1.The personality traits found in this study can help teachers understand their students' personalities and these can be used as a guideline to develop learning contexts that suit students' personalities or to individualize teaching. The implications can be drawn on creating a balanced classroom environment to facilitate language learning for both traits.

2.This study revealed that low achievement students both Muslim and Non-Muslim, were extrovert. It can be implied that being extrovert or too relaxed

sometimes may not help them in learning. However, English teachers can make use of this trait in designing relevant activities as these students are willing to participate in class. By doing this the weak extrovert students can improve their proficiency.

### **Limitations**

To investigate learners' variations, specifically the extroversion and introversion dimensions, the current study employed merely two types of data assessment which were interpreted quantitatively and qualitatively: Myer-Briggs questionnaire and interviews. It is recommended that other instruments, for example, class observation and portfolio should be used in the assessment. Furthermore, the study investigated only from the perspective of students. Thus, the reflections from parents, teachers, or their peers may be considered in future research.

### **References**

- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-Extraversion and the Efl Proficiency of Japanese Students. *Language Learning*, 32(1), 109–132. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1982.tb00521.x
- Carrell, P. L., Prince, M. S., & Astika, G. G. (1996). Personality Types and Language Learning in an EFL Context. *Language Learning*, 46(1), 75–99. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb00641.x
- Dewaele, J.-M., & Furnham, A. (1999). Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning*, 49, 509-544.
- El-Dib, M. A. B. (2004). *Language Learning Strategies in Kuwait: Links to Gender*,



- Language Level, and Culture in a Hybrid Context. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(1), 85–95.
- Gan, Z. (2008). Extroversion and group oral performance: A mixed quantitative and discourse analysis approach. *The Hong Kong Institution of Education*, 23(3), 116- 127.
- Kezwer, P. (1987). The Extroverted Vs. the Introverted Personality and Second Language Learning. *TESL Canada Journal*, 5(1), 45–58.
- Leaver, B. L., Ehrman, M. E., & Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving success in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lievens F, Ones D, Dilchert S (2009) Personality scale validities increase throughout medical school. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1514–1535
- Lightbown, P. M. and Spada, N. (2006) *How languages are learned*. (3rd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: what every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.
- Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001). Big Five predictors of academic achievement. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35, 78–90.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.2000.2309>
- Quenk, N. & Kummerow J. (2001). *MBTI Step II Interpretive Report*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Quenk, N. L. (2009). *Essentials of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator assessment* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rattanayart, W. (2007). *A study of attitudes and problems in teaching English in Islamic religious schools in Yala* (Master's Thesis). Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand.

- Rubin, J. (1975). What the "Good Language Learner" Can Teach Us. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 41. doi:10.2307/3586011
- Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, E. (2011). Extraversion and introversion in second-language acquisition: a literature review. *日本大学歯学部紀要*, 39, 1-10.

## VITAE

**Name**            Munir Laeha

**Student ID**    5611120004

### **Educational Attainment**

<b>Degree</b>	<b>Name of Institution</b>	<b>Year of Graduation</b>
Bachelor of Arts	Thaksin University	2012

### **Scholarship Awards during the enrollment**

Scholarship supported by Graduate School, PSU, Hatyai Campus

Scholarship supported by Liberal Arts, PSU, Hatyai Campus

### **List of Publication and Proceedings**

Laeha, M., & Charumanee, N. (summitted manuscript). English language learning strategies: A comparison between Muslim and non-Muslim students. *Journal of liberal Arts*, Prince of Sonhkla University Hat Yai Campus, Hat Yai, Songkla 90110

Laeha, M., & Charumanee, N. (2015). Personality traits: Acomparison study of Muslim and non-Muslim students. *The 7<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences on "ASEAN 2015: Challenges and Opportunities"* June 6, 2015. Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University Proceedings. Pp. 75-86