

Relationship between Creativity and Language Learning Strategies in Adults Learners

Fereshteh Faryadres, Masoud Gholamali lavasani

E-mail: maniya.faryad@gmail.com

Faculty of Education and Psychology, University Of Tehran (Iran)

Abstract

Present research perform to study relationship between creativity e langue learning strategies among per-university Iranian adults which try to learn English language as a foreign language. A sample of 224 (male=124, females=100), was selected using multi-stage clustering sampling from region 1-2-3 and 4 of Tehran city .gender and creativity proposed to independent variables and language learning strategies proposed to be dependent variable. Subjects completed 1) Strategy inventory for language learning questioner and 2) Creativity questioner. Language learning Strategies consider 6 small scale of include : memory ,cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, social ,affective strategies .creativity questioner consider 4: fluency, elaboration, ,originality, flexibility .the results of Pearson correlation analysis showed that there is meaningful relation between memory strategies with 3 components of creativity include fluency, elaboration, ,originality in level , $r=.13$, $p<.05$. There are meaningful relations between metacognitive strategies with fluency in level $r=. 23$, $p<.000$ and with elaboration in level $r=. 26$, $p<.000$ and with originality in level $r=. 17$, $p<.001$, cognitive strategies just have meaningful relation with flexibility component in level $r=. 19$, $p<. 001$. Results of regression analysis indicate that, elaboration component has role in forecasting metacognitive $R^2=. 11$, $F (5.54)$ and fluency component has role in forecasting compensation $R^2=.03$, $F (1.59)$ and, flexibility component has role in forecasting cognitive $R^2=.04$, $F (2.21)$ but this impress is very low. Result T-test indicate that just gender have meaningful relation in the usage of metacognitive and affective in level ($p<.001$) .other results of founds show that women have more inclination to metacognitive strategies usage compared with men and men use memory strategies more than other strategies . Totality research indicate that there isn't so many different between gender and usage of any type of language learning strategies and creativity (independent variable) have less impress on forecasting usage of language learning strategies.

1. Introduction

Learning English language is one of the most important education matters in most of school in throughout the world. In Iran students receive English instruction in secondary schools, high schools and universities. English presented as training subjects after primarily level, student don't get necessary minimums about English instruction is often inadequate for students to develop English fluency and many teachers talk about English instead of speaking it.

Research into Language strategies began in the 1960s.Rubin (1975) classified strategies in terms of processes contributing directly or indirectly to language learning. Focus of education research changed from behavior theory to cognitive in the 1950s- 1960s, learning became knowledge acquisition. In Cognitive theory, the learner becomes a processor of information .As cognitive theory matured during the 1970s and 1980s .The dominant focus became learning as knowledge construction (Tensing, 2005

Foreign or second language (LS) learning strategies are specific actions, behaviors, steps or techniques students use often consciously to improve their progress in apprehending, internalizing, and using the L2 (Oxford, 1994.) Research indicates that language learners at all level use strategies but that some or most learners are not fully aware of the strategies they use or the strategies that might be most beneficial to employ (Oxford, 1989).

The term LLS is used more generally for all strategies are that L2/FL learners use in learning the target language, and communication strategies are therefore just one type LLS .For all L2 teachers who aim to help develop their students communicative competence and language learning, then, an understanding of LLS is critical. LLS are important because research suggests that training students to use LLS can help them become better language learners. (Clouston,1997).

Language learning strategies have been classified by many scholars (Rubin 1987, O'Malley 1985, Stern 1992 and oxford 1990, etc.).Oxford (1990) sees the aim of language learning strategies as being oriented towards the development of communication competence. Oxford (1990) divides language learning strategies into main classes, direct and indirect, which are further subdivided into 6 groups (Hismanoglu, 2000).

According to oxfords definition, language learning strategies which directly involve the target language are called direct strategies. These strategies include memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies. All of these direct involve mental processing of language .On the other hand ,indirect strategies are metacognitive ,affective ,and social strategies and they “provide indirect support for language learning through focusing ,planning ,evaluating ,seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increasing cooperation and empathy ,and other means”(Oxford,1990;seek chang 2009).

Recent research try to answer following question;1) Is there any relation between creativity and memory strategies use, 2) Is there any relation between creativity and cognitive strategies use, 3) Is there any relation between creativity and compensation strategies use, 4) Is there any relation between creativity and metacognitive strategies use,5) Is there any relation between creativity and social strategies use, 6) Is there any relation between creativity and affective strategies use, 7) Is there any relation between gender and language learning strategies, 8) Is there any relation between gender and creativity, and 9) Is there any relation gender and using kinds of learning strategies?

2. Methodology

2-1. participants and Sampling

Statistic community of this research is a sample of 224 (male = 124, females = 100) from region 1-2-3 and 4 in Tehran was selected using multi-stage clustering sampling

Table 1 Frequency distribution and percent of sample group according to gender separation

gender	Frequency	Percent
Men	100	44.64
Women	124	55.35
Total	224	100

2-2. Instrumentation

Used tools in this research are 2 questionnaires of creativity and language learning strategies questionnaire .explain them below:

- A) Creativity questionnaire using to evaluate creativity according to “Abedi creativity power questionnaire”. Abedi creativity questionnaire have 60 questions with 3 choices. Stability coefficient related to creativity in present research attain for fluency (.61).Elaboration (.50), originality (.41), flexibility (.55) and total alpha coefficient (.73
- B) Language learning strategies questionnaire (oxford, 1990) was established according to 5 choice classification of likert spectrum (always, usually, some time, rarely, never). Rezaei and Almasian (2007) report their research about kranbakh alpha (.93). Borzabadi farahani and Nejati (2008) report kranbakh alpha (.90) indicating high stability coefficient. The structure alpha of metacognitive and social strategies estimated respect (.86) which is acceptable. In this study attains alpha coefficient of scale for memory (.61), cognitive (.66), metacognitive (.75), compensation (.46), social (.58), affective (.51), and total alpha coefficient (.89)

3. Found

3.1. Use 2 creativity powers and language learning strategies scale to study relations between creative and language learning strategies of comprehensives. So use cohesion coefficient method and multi-variable variance analysis

Table2.

Cohesion coefficient between scale of learning strategies and gender and creativity

Variable	Memory	Affective	Met cognitive	Compensation	Social	Cognitive	Fluency	Elaboration	Originality	Flexibility	Gender
Memory	-										
Affective	0.45**	-									
Met cognitive	0.56**	0.38**	-								
Compensation	0.42**	0.37**	0.43**	-							
Social	0.45**	0.45**	0.54**	0.50**	-						
Cognitive	0.64**	0.50**	0.62**	0.55**	0.60**	-					
Fluency	0.13*	0.05	0.23**	0.10	0.03	.08	-				
Elaboration	0.13*	-0.10	0.26**	-0.03	0.03	.08	.38**	-			
Originality	0.13*	-0.01	0.17**	-0.02	-0.01	.07	0.37**	.39**	-		
Flexibility	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.07	0.11	.19**	.17**	-.01	.32**	-	
Gender	-0.03	0.17**	0.21**	-0.09	-0.05	-.03	.22**	.39**	.11	.15	

** Correlation is significant at the $p < .001$ 2.1.1

* Correlation is significant at the $p < .005$

Table 2 indicates cohesion between research variable. There is significant difference between memory strategies with fluency and elaboration and originality ($p < .005$) according to table. Cohesion coefficient between cognitive strategies and flexibility indicate significant difference ($p < .005$). A significant difference is between metacognitive strategies and fluency, elaboration and originality ($p < .001$). There isn't difference between social, compensation, affective strategies and fluency, elaboration, originality, flexibility according to cohesion coefficient. ($p < .05$) .A significant difference here is only between affective and Metacognitive strategies ($p < .001$) with gender.

3-2.step by step regression analysis

Table 3

Summary of step by step regression analysis of learning strategies scale

Variable	df	R	R ²	SE	F	Sig
Memory	5	.20	.04	.45	1.95	.08
Affective	5	.22	.04	.53	2.27	.04
Meta cognitive	5	.33	.11	.51	5.54	.00
compensation	5	.18	.03	.50	1.59	.16
Social	5	.15	.02	.56	.99	.42
Cognitive	5	.22	.04	.41	2.21	.05

Below findings detected according to table3: No difference was found between social, compensation memory, strategies and fluency, elaboration, originality, flexibility and gender, but a significant difference was found between metacognitive ,cognitive and affective strategies with fluency, elaboration, originality, flexibility and gender. Creativity doesn't affect on predicting these strategies. Result indicating $R^2 = .04, F(1.95)$ for memory, $R^2 = .04, F(2.21)$ for cognitive strategies, $R^2 = .03, F(1.59)$ for compensation strategies and $R^2 = .11, F(5.54)$ for metacognitive strategies, $R^2 = .02, F(0.99)$ for social strategies and $R^2 = .04, F(2.27)$ for affective strategies justifying by 5 independent variable. These dispersion amount are so less for predicting dependent variables.

3-3.step by step regression coefficients

Table4. Step by step regression coefficient forecasting learning strategies according to creative and gender variable

Variable		b	t	Beta	Sig
Memory strategies	Gender	-.09	-1.39	-.10	.16
	Fluency	.15	1.10	.08	.27
	Elaboration	.20	1.58	.12	.11
	Originality	.08	.60	.04	.54
	Flexibility	.07	.64	.04	.52

	Gender	-.16	-2.12	-.15	.03
Affective strategies	Fluency	.27	1.63	.12	.10
	Elaboration	-.15	-1.00	-.08	.31
	Originality	-.06	-.37	-.03	.70
	Flexibility	.12	.87	.06	.38
Metacognitive strategies	Gender	.15	2.02	.14	.04
	Fluency	.25	1.61	.11	.10
	Elaboration	.28	1.96	.15	.05
	Originality	.05	.31	.02	.75
	Flexibility	.19	1.40	.09	.16
Compensation strategies	Gender	-.11	-1.45	-.10	.14
	Fluency	.33	2.10	.15	.03
	Elaboration	-.02	-.20	-.01	.83
	Originality	-.17	-1.11	-.08	.26
	Flexibility	.11	.83	.06	.40
Social strategies	Gender	-.07	-.87	-.06	.38
	Fluency	.05	.30	.02	.76
	Elaboration	.17	1.09	.08	.27
	Originality	-.19	-1.12	-.09	.26
	Flexibility	.25	1.72	.12	.08
Cognitive strategies	Gender	-.04	-.66	-.04	.50
	Fluency	.05	.39	.03	.69
	Elaboration	.16	1.41	.11	.15
	Originality	-.05	-.45	-.03	.65
	Flexibility	.29	2.66	.19	.00

According to table 4 about related Memory strategies variable of gender and creativity, “t” is not meaningful in independent variables (gender and 4 component of creativity, $p < .005$), indicate that “t” related to gender and creativity don’t effect on predicting forecasting memory strategies according to regression equation. Standard regression coefficient of elaboration in above table is (Beta=.12), having most weight compared with other elements.

According to result of Affective strategies that “t” “isn’t meaningful in creativity ($p < .005$).” $t = -2.12$ is meaningful just in gender ($p < .005$), indicating “t” “related to creativity don’t have impress in predicting affective strategies in regression equation, gender has role in predicting affective strategies. The standard

regression coefficient of gender in above table is (Beta =-.15) having most weight compared with other elements.

Result of Metacognitive strategies indicating “t” isn’t meaningful in 3 component of independent variable include fluency, originality and flexibility ($p<.005$). Just is meaningful in gender ($t= 2.02, p<.005$) and elaboration component ($t=1.96, p<.005$), indicate that elaboration, originality and flexibility don’t have impress in predicting metacognitive strategies to regression equation. The Beta standard regression coefficient of gender is (.14) and elaboration is (.15) having most weight compared with other elements.

Result of Compensation strategies indicating “t” don’t have affect on independent variable of elaboration, originality, flexibility and gender ($p<.005$). $t=2.10$ is meaningful just in fluency ($p<.005$), indicating that “t” related to elaboration, originality and flexibility doesn’t have impress on predicting compensation strategies of regression equation. Beta standard regression coefficient of fluency is (0.15) having the most weight compared with other elements and have most impress of it on dependent variable of compensation strategies

Using result of Social strategies “t” isn’t meaningful for independent variable of fluency ,elaboration ,originality and flexibility and gender ($p<.005$) and “t” of these component doesn’t have impress on predicting social strategies in regression equation. Beta standard regression coefficient of flexibility is (.12) having most weight compared with other elements

Result s of cognitive strategies indicating “t” isn’t meaningful with fluency, elaboration, originality and gender ($p<.005$). Flexibility have impress ($p<.001$).” t” of fluency, elaboration, originality and gender didn’t have impress on predicting cognitive strategies in regression equation .Beta standard regression coefficient of flexibility is(.19) having most weight compared with other elements.

Used t-test for studying the impress of gender on learning strategies .Results have shown in table 5.

Table5.

T–test for studying impresses of gender on learning strategies variables

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Sig
Memory	Men	100	2.59	.60
	Women	124	2.55	
Affective	Men	100	2.43	.01
	Women	124	2.25	
Metacognitive	Men	100	2.54	.00
	Women	124	2.78	

A significant difference wasn’t found between gender and scales of memory, compensation, social, cognitive strategies ($p<.005$). A significant difference was found between metacognitive and gender ($p<.001$) and between gender and affective ($p<.005$). Using realized males use more memory, affective, compensation, social and cognitive strategies compared with females. Although average different in using kinds of strategies are not significant for males and females. Females just use metacognitive strategies



more than males. Highest realized average is (2.78) in using metacognitive strategies by females learner's and highest average in using memory strategies by males is (2.59).

4. Discussion and conclusion

Result of researches of Rezaei and Almasian (2007) indicating a significant difference was found creativity and language learning strategies, but kasaeian and kasaeian (2005) express that there isn't any significant difference between language and any personality properties like creative self confidence, responsibility and cohesion proneness. Other found of this research which have similar research with most of performed research indicating that language learning strategies have been used by males and females learners. Learners use cognitive, metacognitive strategies more than others. There isn't so much differences between gender and language learning strategies according to research of Oxford & Burry (1995), Oxford & Ehrman (1995), Yang (1999), Wang & Spencer & Xing (2009), Chen (2009), Chang (2009), Rezaei and Almasian (2007), Magogwe & Oliver (2007), Huang (2003-07), Hong & Leavell (2006), Tavakoli (2006), Griffiths (2004), Griffiths (2003), Griffiths & M.Parr (2001), Lunt (2000)

Some studied have found that females use more strategies than males (Oxford, Park-oh, Ito & Sumral 1993; kaylani, 1996; seek Chamot 2005). Recent research found indicate that males use memory strategies more than other strategies and females use metacognitive strategies more than others

Oxford (1994) expresses that rote memorization and other forms of memorization were more prevalent among some Asian students than among students from other cultural also appeared to encourage this strategy among learners. Recent researches found indicate that males use memory strategies more than other strategies

Note that second language learners, who are learning a language in an environment where the language is the manes of daily survival and communication, typically use more learning strategies than do foreign language learners, who are learning a language in an environment where that language is not the everyday means of communication (oxford, 1992a; see oxford & Ehrman, 1995). The comparatively greater level of strategy use by FSI foreign language learners might be explainable by two factors; first, they are relatively experienced language learners who already know a great deal about how to learn; and second, they are in intensive training, which is more like a second –language learning environment than is the usual foreign language classroom (oxford & Ehrman, 1995

As other researchers like Chang (2009), Wang & Spencer & Xing (2009), Huang (2003-07), Alptekin (2007), Hong-Nam & Leavell (2006), Hismanoglu (2000), Griffiths & M.Parr (2001) suggest that strategies training to teachers, having knowledge of student, not preventing students creativity in language class, having mistake in speaking and don't have fear from mistake, tolerance for ambiguity, motivation in learning and encouraging learner's improve and help language learning strategies using to ameliorate language learning process. Age is a clear factor which affects the way strategies are used by language learners. Oxford (1994) express about age and language level (L2) that student of different ages and stage of L2 leaning used different strategies, with certain strategies often being employment by older or more advanced student.

Making teachers aware about active role of student in class and learning purpose determination in learning English language is so important. It is necessary to research about type of language learning strategies are used by weak and strength student. It should be studied that some student are more successful in learning foreign or second language and they use which strategies and activities for better understanding and easier language learning and reaching to success in foreign language acquisition.

References

1. Borzabadi, D. & Nejati, R. (2008). *Investigation of the construct validity and Reliability of oxford* (Strategies Inventory for language learning SILL). Foreign languages Journal of university Tehran: NO.5.Special Issue .pp5-22.
2. Chamot, A. U.(2004).*Issues in language learning strategies research and teaching*, the George Washington University. Electronic Journal of foreign language teaching, 2004, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 14-26, © Centre for Language Studies, National University of Singapore.
3. Chang, F. h.(2009)"*Language learning strategies of Taiwanese college level EFL/ESL student*, A dissertation presented to the faculty of the graduate School of Education University. Proquest LLC,789 East Eisenhower Parkway, D.O. Box 1346, Ann Arbor.MI48106-1346.
4. Chen , M.L.(2009)"*Influence of grade level on perceptual preferences and language learning strategies of Taiwanese English as a foreign language learners*"Department of applied English ,Hung Kuang University,34 Chung-Chie Rd sha Lu, Taichung, Taiwan, Roc Learning Style.
5. Clouston M. L. (1997). *Language learning strategies: An overview for L2=teacher*, Kwansai Gakuin University, (Nishinomiya Japan). The Internet TESL Journal, Vol.VI, No. 8.
6. Griffiths, C. &M.Parr, J (2001)"*Language learning strategies: Theory and perception*"ELT Journal Volume 55/3 July 2001.Oxford University Press.
7. Griffiths, C. (2004).*Language learning strategies*, School of foundation studies AIS St Helens .Auckland .New Zealand. *Accessional paper NO1*.
8. Griffiths, C.(2003),*Patterns of language learning strategy use*, Auckland Institute of studies(AIS),Box 2995, Auckland, New Zealand, accepted 3Jun 2003,System31(367-383).
9. Hismanoglu, Murat (2000). *Language learning strategies in foreign language learning and teaching*, Hacettepe University.(Ankara.Turkry).The Internet TESL Journal, Vol.VI.No.8.
10. Hong-Nam, K.& Leavell, A. G.(2006).*Language learning strategy use of ESL students in an Intensive English learning context*, Department of teacher education and administration ,University of North Texas ,Denton,TX76203,USA.
11. Huang, Hy. (2003-07).*Can learning strategies be taught in classroom*, General education center, Chin-yi institute of technology.
12. Kasaeian, z & Kasaeian, n. (2007).*English language and its relation to the personality traits of the exception talents* , journal of psychology & education, vol 37, no.2, pp.21-37.
13. Lunt, E.H. (2000).*The learning strategies of adult immigrant learners of English: quantitative and qualitative .PhD thesis* .Department of linguistics and applied linguistics .University of Melbourne. <http://eprints.unmelb.edu.au/archive/10187/940>.
14. Magogwe, J.M. & Oliver, R (2007). *The relation between language learning strategies proficiency age and self- efficacy beliefs": A study of language learners in Botswana*, Volume 35, Issue3, and Pages338-358.
15. Oxford, R. (1989).*The role of styles and strategies in second language learning*, ERIC Digest, ERIC Digest .ERIC clearinghouse and linguistic Washington DC.
16. Oxford, R. (1994).*Language learning strategies: Un update ERIC Digest*, ERIC Digest .ERIC clearinghouse and linguistic Washington DC. <http://www.vmcsatellite.com/aid=51733>.
17. Oxford, R. L& Ehrman, M.E.(1995)"*Adults language learning strategies in an Intensive foreign language program in the United State*,System,Vol,23,No,3,pp.359-386.University of Alabama, U.S.A. Foreign Service Institute, U.S.A.
18. Oxford, R.& Burry-Stock, J.(1995).*Assessing the of use language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy Inventory for language learning(SILL)*,University of Alabama,Tuscaloosa,AL,USA,System,Vol,23,pp,1-23.
19. Rezaei, A. A. &Almasian .M.(2007).*Creativity and language learning strategies and proficiency*. foreign languages Journal of university Tehran.No.32.Special Issue, English, 2007. Pp 65-76.
20. Tavakoli, H. (2006). The impact of language learning strategies on the development of reading comprehension,M. A. *English as a foreign language*. Isfahan University.
21. Tseng, S.F. (2005)" *Language learning strategies in foreign language Education*.WHAMPOA-An Interdisciplinary Journal49, 321-328.Department of applied foreign Language, Cheng Shiu University.



22. Wang, J. & Spencer, K. & Xing, M.(2009).*Metacognitive beliefs and strategies in learning Chinese as a foreign language. Volume37, Issue1, Page 45-56..www.elsevier.com/locate/System.*
23. Yang, Nae -Dong (1999).*The relationship between learner's beliefs and learning strategy use.* Department of foreign language and literatures, National Taiwan university, Taipei 10617, Taiwan, Roc, System 27,515-535.