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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological study was to describe the perceived experience of second language acquisition for adult second language learners in a formal learning environment at the Community College of Virginia (a pseudonym) and to describe how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of second language acquisition. All students who were enrolled in an introductory-level Spanish course at the Community College of Virginia were invited to complete a preliminary questionnaire to determine their initial eligibility for the study. Prospective participants who met the initial eligibility requirements of the study took the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Complete questionnaire to determine their personality type. A purposeful sampling procedure was used to secure six participants, each with different personality types, for an in-depth study of their perceived experience of second language acquisition. The data were collected through semi-structured interviews, open-ended journal entries, and semi-structured focus groups, and were analyzed using phenomenological reflection. The adult second language learners at the Community College of Virginia defined second language acquisition as the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in a variety of formats. These learners were apprehensive about their experience acquiring a second language, but they perceived that using their second language outside of the classroom had enhanced their experience. They also perceived that being outgoing, sociable, adaptable, and open had enhanced their experience.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

This chapter begins with a brief background on adult learners’ enrollment in a second language (L2) course, on second language acquisition (SLA), and on personality type. My motivation for conducting the current study is addressed, along with the practical and empirical significance of the study. The problem statement and the purpose statement are introduced, along with the research question (and subquestions) that guided the study. A brief description of the research and its delimitations are also discussed.

Background

The choice for adult learners to enroll in an introductory-level L2 course at a community college can be informed by varying motivational factors, such as earning a degree, enhancing the opportunities for employment, or travelling to a foreign country. Community colleges usually offer a variety of introductory-level L2 courses in order to meet the diverse learning needs of their students. In Virginia, some community colleges offer specialized courses that are designed to teach basic oral communication skills to adult learners with no previous formal instruction in an L2 (Virginia Community College System, 2015). Other courses, which introduce basic communication skills in reading, writing, and speaking, are open to all adult learners (Virginia Community College System, 2015). Formal instruction in an L2 is defined as instruction, usually classroom-based, in which target vocabulary and grammar rules are taught in isolation and in which opportunities exist for error detection and feedback (Krashen & Seliger, 1975).

Despite the intended focus on communication in these courses, adult learners taking introductory-level L2 courses in a formal learning environment (FLE) may not actually acquire the target language. SLA is defined as the subconscious attainment of an L2 through meaningful
communication in the target language (Krashen, 2002). The actual level of SLA for adult learners varies; in fact, some people may be unable to learn an L2 at all (Bley-Vroman, 1990; Hellman, 2011). However, this deficiency usually is attributed to a lack of motivation to learn the language (Bley-Vroman, 1990; Roberts & Meyer, 2012). Other individual differences, such as personality type, may also contribute. However, the results for studies that have linked personality and SLA have been largely inconsistent as a result of methodological and conceptual differences (Sharp, 2008). Furthermore, most studies on personality and SLA have been quantitative (Chen & Hung, 2012; Fayyaz & Kamal, 2011; Kayaoğlu, 2013), with no in-depth understanding of these students’ perceptions of their experiences acquiring an L2.

Personality type is usually assessed by either the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998) or by the Jung Type Indicator (Budd, 1993). Both assessments are self-report questionnaires designed to make Jung’s (1971) theory of psychological types understandable and useful to everyday life. These assessments identify people’s preferences in terms of psychological processes or functions. However, the MBTI differs from the Jung Type Indicator in that the MBTI views these functions as discrete categories or dichotomies, rather than as variables on a continuum (Budd, 1993).

The MBTI assesses personality type based on four dichotomies: extraversion-introversion, sensing-intuition, thinking-feeling, and judging-perceiving. The extraversion-introversion dichotomy reflects a person’s preference for the orientation of energy. Extraversion (E) indicates a preference for directing one’s energy toward the outer world of people and objects; introversion (I) indicates a preference for directing one’s energy toward the inner world of experiences and ideas (Myers et al., 1998). The sensing-intuition dichotomy reflects a person’s preference for the process of perception. Sensing (S) indicates a preference for focusing
on what can be perceived through the five senses; intuition (N) indicates a preference for focusing on what can be perceived through patterns and interrelationships (Myers et al., 1998). The thinking-feeling dichotomy reflects a person’s preference for the process of judgment in drawing conclusions. Thinking (T) indicates a preference for basing conclusions on logic, objectivity, and detachment; feeling (F) indicates a preference for basing conclusions on personal or social values and harmony (Myers et al., 1998). The judging-perceiving dichotomy reflects a person’s preference for how he or she deals with the outside world. Judging (J) indicates a preference for decisiveness and the use of either thinking or feeling; perceiving (P) indicates a preference for flexibility and the use of either sensing or intuition (Myers et al., 1998). There are 16 possible combinations of the MBTI preferences, each of which indicate a distinct personality type (e.g., ISTJ, ENFP). Although it is possible to consider each dichotomy separately, a thorough examination of the combination of the four preferences provides the richest picture of a person’s personality type (Myers, 1998).

**Situation to Self**

I have taught Spanish as an L2 for 11 years. My experience teaching an L2 includes both introductory-level (first-year) Spanish courses as well as intermediate-level (second-year) Spanish courses. Although my experience teaching an L2 has always been at the secondary level of instruction, my interest in andragogy inspired me to research how adult learners acquire an L2, particularly in an FLE.

My motivation for conducting this study stemmed from my desire to understand why some learners appear to be able to acquire the L2 more easily than others. I wondered whether or not personality type had an influence on the experience of SLA for these learners. I also
wondered how L2 learners would describe their experience of SLA, and whether they believed that their personality type had any influence on this experience.

This study was guided by a pragmatic approach to understanding the experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE. I desired to find new methods of L2 instruction for those adult learners who were having trouble acquiring the L2. Conducting this study provided me with new insight into how L2 instruction could be differentiated in order to enhance the experience of SLA for learners of different personality types.

**Problem Statement**

This hermeneutic phenomenological study sought to address the need to better understand the perceived experience of SLA for adult learners in an FLE. Whether or not they have had any previous formal instruction in the language, adult L2 learners vary with respect to their ultimate level of SLA (Hakuta, Bialystok, & Wiley, 2003; Hellman, 2011). SLA is often measured by means of a proficiency test (Ockey, 2011) or by the use of self-report questionnaires (Badstübner & Ecke, 2009; Ghapanchi, Khajavy, & Asadpour, 2011). To the best of my knowledge, however, no studies have been conducted that aim to describe adult learners’ perceived experiences of SLA through an in-depth investigation into the phenomenon.

This study also sought to address the need to better understand how adult learners in an FLE perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA. Prior studies link SLA to individual differences such as learning style or motivation (Engin, 2009; Erton, 2010); however, research on the link between SLA and personality type has been scarce (Arispe & Blake, 2012). The completed studies have been mostly correlational, focusing primarily on the extraversion-introversion dichotomy, to the exclusion of the others (Fayyaz & Kamal, 2011; Kayaoğlu, 2013). There was a need to explore how the other dichotomies
associated with personality type may also have influenced these learners’ perceptions of their experience of SLA. Furthermore, there was a need to understand how the interaction among these dichotomies may have influenced how the experience of SLA was perceived by these learners.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological study was to describe the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at the Community College of Virginia (CCVA, a pseudonym) and to describe how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA.

**Significance of the Study**

The results of this hermeneutic phenomenological study have practical and empirical implications for community college students, college enrollment advisors, and college professors. Community college students and their enrollment advisors need to better understand how the experience of SLA was perceived by adult learners taking an introductory-level L2 course in an FLE, as well as how these learners perceived that their personality type influenced their experience of SLA. Counseling sessions between community college students and their advisors could facilitate the students’ understanding of how their personality type is related to their successes or to their problems in learning a language (Fazeli, 2012). The information that was gleaned from this study could also be used by community college students and their enrollment advisors to determine whether or not placement in an L2 course is practical or suitable for them. The thick description and detail that was employed in this study allow other community college students and their enrollment advisors to make informed decisions about the transferability of the findings to the students’ individual educational circumstances.
Professors at community colleges also need to recognize how the experience of SLA was perceived by adult learners taking an introductory-level L2 course in an FLE. Professors could also benefit from the knowledge of how these learners’ personality types influenced their perceptions of their experience of SLA. This knowledge is important because, as Erton (2010) explained, “There is a close connection between the personality of the student, the style and the strategy that the student develops in order to learn and the success (academic performance) achieved from a particular course” (p. 115). Professors could also utilize this information to differentiate instruction and to incorporate a variety of instructional strategies into the curriculum. Knowing how their students actually learn would make the professors’ teaching more effective (Natsumi, 2000).

**Research Questions**

Patton (2002) described the essence of a phenomenon as “the core meanings mutually understood through a phenomenon commonly experienced” (p. 106). The essence of the phenomenon, which entails not only what is experienced, but also how it is experienced, is viewed as the culminating aspect of a phenomenological study (Creswell, 2013). Based on the literature surrounding SLA, this hermeneutic phenomenological study was guided by the central research question: What is the essence of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA? The central question was also divided into six subquestions.

Two subquestions were designed to determine how the participants defined SLA at a given point in time. These provided the context for what was experienced, which was an integral part of determining the essence of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). Because it was possible for the participants’ interpretations to change as they encountered the phenomenon, it was necessary to distinguish between how they defined SLA at the beginning of the introductory-level Spanish
course and how they defined SLA at the end of the introductory-level Spanish course. The participants were given a nontechnical definition for the phrase, as defined by Krashen (2009): “picking-up’ a language” (p. 10). However, the participants needed to be able to formulate their own understanding of the meaning of SLA in order to thoroughly describe their perceived experience of the phenomenon. This is because phenomenological descriptions “are possible only by turning from things to their meaning, from what is to the nature of what is” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 225).

Two subquestions were designed to determine how the participants described their experience of SLA. How a phenomenon is experienced is also an essential part of determining the essence of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). Because SLA is a process, two separate subquestions were necessary to distinguish between how the participants described their experience of SLA as they progressed through the introductory-level Spanish course and how they described their experience of SLA at the end of the introductory-level Spanish course. SLA has often been measured by means of a proficiency test (Ockey, 2011) or by the use of self-report questionnaires (Badstübner & Ecke, 2009; Ghapanchi et al., 2011). However, these subquestions were designed to provide a more in-depth understanding of the participants’ perceptions of their experience of SLA.

Two subquestions were designed to determine how the participants perceived that their personality type influenced their overall experience of SLA. Because the participants could have a different understanding of their personality type and its influence on their experience of SLA at the beginning of an introductory-level Spanish course than at the end of the course, two separate subquestions were necessary. These subquestions were developed from the literature on individual differences in SLA. The literature has addressed such individual difference variables
as language aptitude, language learning motivation, language learning strategies, learning styles, L2 anxiety, linguistic self-confidence, and willingness to communicate in the L2 (Cao, 2011; Dixon et al., 2012; Dörnyei, 2010; Droździal-Szelest & Pawlak, 2012; Engin, 2009; Erton, 2010; Ghonsooly, Khajavy, & Asadpour, 2012; Hummel, 2013; Révész, 2011; Skehan, 2014; Young-Gyo, 2013). In comparison to other individual difference variables, personality type has received very little attention in the literature on SLA (Arispe & Blake, 2012). Investigating the nature of the perceived influence of personality type on SLA added an important piece to the literature on SLA.

The six subquestions that emerged from the literature were:

**RQ1:** How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the beginning of an introductory-level Spanish course?

**RQ2:** In what ways do these learners anticipate that their personality type will either enhance or inhibit their experience of SLA?

**RQ3:** How do these learners describe their experience of SLA as they progress through an introductory-level Spanish course?

**RQ4:** How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

**RQ5:** How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

**RQ6:** In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?
Research Plan

This study was conducted using qualitative research methods and a hermeneutic phenomenological design. Qualitative research is appropriate whenever a problem or issue needs to be explored or whenever the researcher needs to get a complex, detailed understanding of the problem (Creswell, 2013). This study sought to address the need to better understand the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE and how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited this experience. Therefore, a qualitative approach was the most appropriate for this study. A phenomenological design is one in which there is “a focus on exploring how human beings make sense of experience and transform experience into consciousness, both individually and as shared meaning” (Patton, 2002, p. 104). Hermeneutics refers to the interpretation of meaning of an object or experience (Schwandt, 2007).

All students who were enrolled in an introductory-level Spanish course at CCVA were invited to take part in this hermeneutic phenomenological study. Prospective participants were asked to complete a preliminary questionnaire to determine their initial eligibility for the study. Those who met the initial eligibility requirements of the study took the MBTI Complete questionnaire to determine their personality type. A purposeful sampling procedure was then used to secure six participants, each with different personality types, for an in-depth study of their perceived experience of second language acquisition. By collecting data through semi-structured interviews, open-ended journal entries, and semi-structured focus groups, I could make sense of how these learners perceived their individual experiences of SLA. By analyzing these data through phenomenological reflection, I was able to describe these learners’ shared perceptions of their experiences of SLA.
Delimitations and Limitations

Several delimitations defined the boundaries of this hermeneutic phenomenological study. The study was conducted using participants from an introductory-level Spanish course at a single multi-campus community college in Virginia. Although introductory-level Spanish courses with similar course descriptions were offered at other community colleges across the state, each community college is free to add prerequisites, corequisites, and other requirements to the course description (Virginia Community College System, 2015). I chose to conduct the study at a single community college to ensure that each participant in the study was exposed to the same requirements for introductory L2 study.

In addition, participant selection was limited to those learners who met the following initial eligibility criteria:

- Participants were at least 18 years of age, and
- Participants spoke English as their native language (L1).

The age delimitation was necessary because this study was intended to describe the perceived experiences of SLA for adult L2 learners. The other delimitation created a more linguistically homogenous sample, which was the key to understanding the shared experience of SLA among these adult L2 learners.

Summary

This chapter began with a brief background on enrollment in L2 courses for adult learners, as well as on SLA and personality type. My motivation to conduct the current study was addressed. The study was guided by a pragmatic approach to understanding how adult L2 learners in an FLE perceived their experience of SLA. The practical and empirical significance of the study was also addressed. The problem statement, the purpose statement, and the six
research subquestions that guided the study were all introduced, as well as a brief description of
the research and its delimitations.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This hermeneutic phenomenological study sought to address two problems: the need to better understand the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE and the need to better understand how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA. This chapter establishes the theoretical framework for the current study and demonstrates the importance of the study in light of the current literature on both SLA and personality type. It ends with a summary of what is already known and what is yet to be known about SLA and personality type, demonstrating how the current study could help address some of those gaps in the literature.

Theoretical Framework

Three theories have been incorporated into the theoretical framework for the current study. Each of these theories helps to provide a basis for understanding the problem of the study and for understanding how the findings of the study could be situated within a greater educational context. The first theory to be discussed is Knowles’ (1970) theory of andragogy. In order to make practical use of the findings of the current study, it is important to understand how adults take in information and how they learn, especially in the context of an FLE. The second theory to be discussed is Krashen’s (2002, 2009) Monitor Theory. This theory provides some perspective on adult second language learning (SLL) and adult SLA. Although the adult L2 learners in this study described their perceived experience of SLA and not their actual experience of SLA, it is essential to understand what the term means from a linguistic perspective. The third theory to be discussed is the type theory of personality, which explains the work of Jung (1971), as well as the work of Briggs and Myers (Briggs, 1926; Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014). The
adult L2 learners in the current study described how they perceived their experience of SLA was either enhanced by or inhibited by their MBTI personality type. In order to fully understand these learners’ descriptions of their experience as it relates to personality type, it is essential to be able to interpret Briggs’ and Myers’ theory of personality type. It is also important to understand the concepts behind Jung’s theory of personality type, from which Briggs’ and Myers’ theory originated.

**Theory of Andragogy**

The term andragogy comes from the Greek words anēr (meaning “man”) and agogos (meaning “leading”), and is defined as “the art and science of helping adults learn” (Knowles, 1970, p. 38). The theory of andragogy was first introduced in the United States by Malcolm Knowles in the early 1970s, but the concepts of adult learning and adult education have been around for much longer. In fact, some of Knowles’ assumptions about how adults learn have their roots in the teachings of ancient philosophers and teachers such as Confucius, Aristotle, Socrates, Plato, and Jesus (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011). These teachers viewed learning to be a process of mental inquiry in which the learners were actively engaged in the learning process and were not merely passive receptors of knowledge (Knowles et al., 2011).

Knowles’ theory of andragogy can also be traced to Eduard Lindeman’s concept of adult education. Although his concept was not confined to a definitive age range, Lindeman did define some assumptions that would make the education of adults (or mature students) different from the education of young children. Five assumptions made up Lindeman’s concept of adult education:

- Adults are motivated to learn according to their needs and interests.
- Adults have a life-centered orientation or approach to learning.
• Adults have a need to be self-directing.
• Adults value experience more than any other resource.
• Adults vary in terms of how they learn, with individual differences increasing as they age. (Lindeman, 1926, Chapter 1)

Five decades later, Lindeman’s assumptions about the education of adults became the foundation for Knowles’ theory of andragogy. Knowles’ theory, however, was made up of six core principles:

• the learner’s need to know,
• the learner’s self-concept,
• the learner’s prior knowledge and experience,
• the learner’s readiness to learn,
• the learner’s orientation to learning, and
• the learner’s motivation to learn (Knowles et al., 2011, Figure 1-1).

Adult learners have a need to know what information they are learning and why it is important for them to learn. Adult learners’ motivation often has intrinsic value (Knowles et al., 2011). As they mature, adult learners also become more self-directed, leading to the need for a more student-centered environment. This student-centered environment contrasts with the more traditional, teacher-centered environment that can be found in many primary and secondary schools. Adults tend to define themselves by their individual experiences as well as by their social roles (Knowles, 1970); therefore, personal anecdotes can be a major resource for the understanding of content in adult education. Problem-centered or contextual learning experiences can also be important for the understanding of content (Knowles et al., 2011). These concepts are
consistent with Lindeman’s (1926) assertion that “experience is the adult learner’s living textbook” (p. 10).

A thorough awareness of the core principles of andragogy is essential to understanding the current study. It specifically sought to address the perceived experiences of SLA for adult L2 learners—those learners who, according to Lindeman (1926), place a high value on their experiences. Because these adult learners are also apt to define themselves according to their experiences, their skills, and their proficiencies (Knowles, 1970), it is possible that they could redefine themselves at the end of the introductory-level Spanish course in terms of their perceived level of SLA.

It is also important to understand these adult L2 learners’ overall orientation to learning, specifically in terms of their preference for problem-centered or contextual learning (Knowles et al., 2011). Bley-Vroman (1988, 1990) hypothesized that adult language acquisition is similar to other types of adult learning in that it requires adults to use problem-solving techniques and to reflect on what they have learned. The open-ended journal entries and the semi-structured interviews and focus groups that were employed in this study allowed the adult L2 learners to reflect on their overall learning experiences in the FLE as well as on their perceived experiences of SLA in the FLE.

**Monitor Theory of Adult SLA**

Many attempts have been made to explain the difference between L1 acquisition in children and SLA in adults. Among these are the Critical Period Hypothesis (Lenneberg, 1967) and the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis (Bley-Vroman, 1990). Krashen’s theory of adult SLA, however, made the assumption that adults actually have the ability to access the same language acquisition device as children (Krashen, 2009). This theory of adult SLA, which is
often termed the Monitor Theory of Adult SLA or simply the Monitor Theory, posited that adults have two independent systems for developing an L2: the conscious process of SLL and the subconscious process of SLA (Krashen, 2002). Although it is important to understand the differences between these two processes, the designation Monitor Theory tends to overlook the other hypotheses that are also essential to the understanding of adult SLA. Krashen’s theory of adult SLA is based on five main assumptions or hypotheses:

- the acquisition-learning distinction,
- the natural order hypothesis,
- the monitor hypothesis,
- the input hypothesis, and
- the affective filter hypothesis (Krashen, 2009, Chapter 2).

The acquisition-learning distinction delineates the processes of adult SLA and adult SLL as two separate language competencies. It purports that the process of adult SLA refers to the natural attainment of an L2. That is, adults acquire an L2 in much the same manner in which they acquired their L1. The process of adult SLL, on the other hand, is distinguished by its emphasis on grammar and lexical rules that have been explicitly taught. In non-technical terms, Krashen (2009) defined SLA as “‘picking-up’ a language” (p. 10), while he defined SLL as “‘knowing about’ a language” (p. 10).

The natural order hypothesis emphasizes the sequence in which adults naturally begin to pick up (or acquire) grammatical structures in their L2. Krashen (2009) asserted that this progression is similar, but not identical, to the manner in which they would have acquired these structures in their L1.
The monitor hypothesis posits that SLA and SLL are very specific to the manner in which they are used: “Acquisition ‘initiates’ [people’s] utterances in a second language and is responsible for [their] fluency. Learning has only one function, and that is as a Monitor, or editor” (Krashen, 2009, p. 15). In addition, Krashen suggested that the Monitor can only be used by language learners if certain conditions are met:

- They must have the time to use it.
- They must be specifically focused on accuracy.
- They must know and understand the grammar rule for the target language (Krashen, 2009, p. 16).

The input hypothesis specifically addresses the process of SLA. This hypothesis posits that people acquire an L2 by understanding that which contains structures just beyond their present level of competence and that fluency emerges on its own as a result of successful communication in a target language (Krashen, 2009).

The affective filter hypothesis helps to explain some of the individual differences among acquirers of an L2. Success in SLA has been linked to such affective factors as motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety (Dixon et al., 2012; Engin, 2009; Krashen, 2009; Young-Gyo, 2013). The affective filter hypothesis proposes that people vary with respect to the level of their affective filters (Krashen, 2009). Success in SLA can be attributed to a person’s low affective filter, whereas a lack success in SLA suggests that a person’s affective filter is high enough that it blocks much of the comprehensible input.

Krashen’s Monitor Theory gives a robust definition of what it means for adults to have acquired an L2. Furthermore, it clarifies the differences between adult SLL and adult SLA. Despite this, Krashen’s acquisition-learning distinction may or may not be perceived by adult L2
learners in an FLE at CCVA. However, the current study aimed to describe these adult L2 learners’ perceived experiences of SLA; it did not aim to describe the learners’ actual experiences of SLA. For this reason, the adult L2 learners in this study were asked to provide their own meaning of SLA, based on either their prior knowledge or their personal beliefs about the topic. The non-technical terminology, “‘picking up’ a language” (Krashen, 2009, p. 10) was also used during this study. This definition gave the adult L2 learners a point from which to begin understanding their anticipated experience of SLA as well as their perceived experience of SLA.

**Type Theory**

Categorizing human differences with respect to temperament or affectivity has been done since ancient times. Jung (1971), however, questioned the assumption that affect was the sole index of personality, and proposed that there were certain modes (or functions) of behavior that were inborn or instinctual. His theory of personality became known as type theory or archetype theory. The term archetype reflects that “which always begins to function when there are no conscious ideas present, or when conscious ideas are inhibited for internal or external reasons” (Jung, 1971, p. 377). Although type theory was first associated with Jung, it has since been extended to include additional attitudes of personality as well as a variety of different means for measuring these variables (Wilde, 2011).

In his discussion on psychological types, Jung specifically mentioned two aspects of type theory: attitudes and functions. He believed that the attitude types should be treated as a separate category, which should be placed hierarchically above the function types (Jung, 1971). Jung defined an attitude as “a readiness of the psyche to act or react in a certain way” (p. 414); he
defined a function as “a particular form of psychic activity that remains the same in principle under varying conditions” (p. 436).

Jung’s (1971) first assumption of type theory delineates the two attitudes of personality: extraversion (E) and introversion (I). These two attitudes refer to the direction in which a person’s psychic energy naturally flows. Jung defined extraversion as “an outward-turning of the libido . . . a positive movement of subjective interest towards the object” (p. 427); he defined introversion as “an inward-turning of libido, in the sense of a negative relation of subject to object” (p. 452). He proposed these two attitudes to be both opposite and equal. Jung emphasized that “A normal introverted attitude is as justifiable and valid as a normal extraverted attitude” (p. 378). According to Jung’s theory, most people exhibit a typical attitude (extraversion or introversion), but this could vary based on whether they are taking in information from their environment or whether they are using information that has already been collected (Jung, 1971; Wilde, 2011).

Jung’s (1971) second assumption delineates two different pairs of psychological functions. The first pair of functions, referred to by Jung as the “rational types,” includes both thinking (T) and feeling (F). These “rational types” are associated with how people make decisions. The thinking type refers to the tendency to make decisions and judgements by coming to objective, logical conclusions, whereas the feeling type refers to the tendency to make decisions and judgements by subjective valuation (Wilde, 2011). The second pair of functions, referred to by Jung as “irrational types,” includes both sensing (S) and intuition (N). These “irrational types” are associated with how people take in or collect information from the world. The sensing type refers to the tendency to take in information through the five senses, whereas
the intuitive type refers to the tendency to take in information by means of the unconscious (Wilde, 2011).

Although never explicitly stated in Jung’s (1971) theory, Wilde (2011) suggested that a third assumption (or postulate) could be inferred from Jung’s work on psychological types. According to Wilde, the attitude energy associated with the decision-making functions (thinking or feeling) is independent of, and usually different from, the attitude energy associated with the information-collecting functions (sensing or intuition). Not only could these functions be linked to how individuals prefer to relate to the world (extraversion or introversion), but also to how these individuals prefer to structure their responses in terms of perception or judgment. Briggs and Myers began their study of personality types around the same time as Jung. Their goal, which was to further develop Jung’s established theory of psychological types, led to their addition of the attitudes of perceiving (P) and judging (J), which were thought to be missing from Jung’s theory (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014; Wilde, 2011). The perceiving attitude can be defined as flexibility, which includes “spontaneity, open-mindedness, understanding, tolerance, curiosity, zest for experience, and adaptability” (Wilde, 2011, p. 13). The judging attitude can be defined as structure, which includes “system, order, planning, sustained effort, decisiveness, authority, opinion, and routine” (Wilde, 2011, p. 13).

The current emphasis of type theory is on type dynamics, which incorporates both the interaction of an individual’s four mental functions (thinking, feeling, sensing, and intuition) as well as a preference for which function is used first (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014). Although everyone uses all four of the psychological functions at one time or another, one of the functions generally predominates in both strength and development (Jung, 1971). This preferred function is usually referred to as the dominant function. The dominant function can be expressed
either outwardly or inwardly, depending on the direction in which the individual’s psychic energy flows. The secondary (or auxiliary) function helps to balance the influence of the dominant function. Jung asserted that in order for the dominant and auxiliary functions to complement each other, their natures must be different, but not antagonistic. This ensures that an individual is able both to take in information and to make decisions; it also ensures that an individual pays attention both to the outer world and to the inner world (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014). The tertiary function refers to an individual’s third-strongest function, and the inferior function refers to an individual’s weakest function. Individuals develop skills in and rely on their dominant and auxiliary functions during adolescence and early adulthood; however, they do not tend to develop their tertiary and inferior functions until mid-life, or even later (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014).

Because the dominant function is expressed differently in the outer world than in the inner world, it is important to distinguish between the eight function-attitudes: extraverted sensing (S_e), introverted sensing (S_i), extraverted intuition (N_e), introverted intuition (N_i), extraverted thinking (T_e), introverted thinking (T_i), extraverted feeling (F_e), and introverted feeling (F_i). Extraverted sensing types are realists who trust in the present and who have a sense for objective facts and concrete data (Jung 1971; Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014). Introverted sensing types are those who trust in the past, comparing the objective facts to their past experience. Extraverted intuitive types are visionaries who constantly seek new possibilities in the external world of ideas and things. Introverted intuitive types are dreamers or artists, who direct their creativity inward. Extraverted thinking types seek logic and consistency in objective data in the outer world, with a concern for external laws and rules. Introverted thinking types seek internal consistency and the logic of subjective ideas. Extraverted feeling types value
generally accepted social standards, and seek harmony with the outer world. Introverted feeling types seek harmony with their inner thoughts and personal values (Jung 1971; Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014).

It is beneficial to note the influence that Jung’s (1971) archetype theory had on Briggs’ and Myers’ theories of personality type and type dynamics. However, an understanding of MBTI personality type is paramount to the understanding of the findings of the current study. The study aimed not only to describe the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE, but also to describe how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA. The adult L2 learners in this study were provided with their reported personality type based on their preferences on the different dichotomies of the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire. Not only did these learners receive an online interpretation of their results, but they also received a personalized interpretation of their results during their primary interview. This allowed these learners to make their own inferences about their MBTI personality type, as well as how they perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA.

**Related Literature**

The current study aimed to describe adult L2 learners’ perceived experience of SLA as well as to describe how these learners’ personality type either enhanced or inhibited this experience. Therefore, it was important to undergo a thorough examination of the literature on both SLA and personality type. The emphasis of this literature review is on those studies that relate to either SLA or personality type among adult learners in an FLE. Relatively few studies have researched the role of personality type on SLA; therefore, these two components are usually discussed separately in this review.
Studies on SLA

A comprehensive examination of the literature revealed numerous studies involving the effects of individual difference variables, the age of acquisition, and the type of learning environment on SLA. In order to paint the clearest picture of how these factors have previously contributed to SLA, each of them will be discussed separately in this literature review.

SLA and individual difference variables. Individual difference variables are defined as “dimensions of enduring personal characteristics that are assumed to apply to everybody and on which people differ by degree” (Dörnyei, 2010, p. 4). Some individual difference variables have received much attention in the literature on SLA. The role of such variables as language aptitude, language learning motivation, language learning strategies, and learning styles has been researched on several occasions (Dixon et al., 2012; Dörnyei, 2010; Droździal-Szelest & Pawlak, 2012; Engin, 2009; Erton, 2010; Skehan, 2014; Young-Gyo, 2013). Other individual difference variables that have been explored specifically in terms of their relationship to SLL and SLA are L2 anxiety (Dixon et al., 2012; Dörnyei, 2010), linguistic self-confidence (Hummel, 2013; Révész, 2011; Young-Gyo, 2013), and willingness to communicate in the L2 (Cao, 2011; Dörnyei, 2010; Ghonsooly et al., 2012). Despite the fact that individual differences are often equated with the variables of personality or intelligence (Dörnyei, 2010), personality type is not often researched in the literature on SLA. Furthermore, previous studies on SLA and personality type have usually been correlational (Chen & Hung, 2012; Fayyaz & Kamal, 2011; Kayaoğlu, 2013). The current study sought to add to the literature on individual differences in SLA by providing more insight into how personality type was perceived to influence adult L2 learners’ experiences of SLA. The hermeneutic phenomenological design of the study was intended to provide a more extensive understanding of the participants’ interpretations and perceptions of
their experiences than the previous correlational studies on SLA and personality type were able to provide.

**SLA and the age of acquisition.** The effect of age on acquisition of an L2 has been a commonly researched topic in the literature on SLA. One of the most recognized names in the literature is Eric Lenneberg, who popularized the concept of the Critical Period Hypothesis. This hypothesis states that there is a short period of time, beginning at approximately two years of age and ending around puberty, during which people could easily acquire a language (Lenneberg, 1967). The Critical Period Hypothesis has definite implications for the acquisition of an L1; however, it has also been attributed to SLL and SLA. Lenneberg stated that “Automatic acquisition from mere exposure to a given language seems to disappear after [puberty], and foreign languages have to be taught and learned through a conscious and labored effort” (p. 176). Krashen (2009) later referred to this conscious, labored effort as adult SLL, a process that he hypothesized to be completely different from that of adult SLA.

Bley-Vroman (1988, 1990) also theorized that an age effect is present in the process of language acquisition, although he questioned the notion of a critical period for language acquisition. He proposed the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis, which states that the manner in which children acquire an L1 is fundamentally different from the manner in which adults acquire an L2 (Bley-Vroman, 1988). He also argued that adult language acquisition was similar to other types of adult learning in that it required adults to reflect and to use problem-solving techniques (Bley-Vroman, 1988, 1990). Though termed language acquisition, this belief about how language was attained is comparable to Krashen’s (2009) definition of adult SLL. In response to these contrasting hypotheses, many studies have tested the effects of age of
acquisition on SLL and SLA, with varying results (Birdsong & Molis, 2001; DeKeyser, 2000; Hakuta et al., 2003; Johnson & Newport, 1989).

Johnson and Newport’s (1989) study was one of the first to test the Critical Period Hypothesis as it related to SLA. This study also prompted several replications, such as those completed by and Birdsong and Molis (2001) and DeKeyser (2000). Before conducting their study, Johnson and Newport recommended two specific ways to clarify the Critical Period Hypothesis. The first stated that humans had a superior capacity for acquiring languages early in life, and if exercised, further language abilities would remain intact throughout the lifespan. The second stated that humans had a superior capacity for acquiring languages early in life, and this ability would disappear or decline with maturation.

Johnson and Newport’s (1989) seminal study explored the influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as an L2. Maturational state was defined by the participants’ age of arrival in the United States, and the acquisition of English was defined by the participants’ performance on a grammar test. The results of the study have been well-documented in the literature on SLA. Johnson and Newport found a strong, significant relationship between the participants’ age of arrival in the United States and their performance on the grammar test. In addition, the relationship between the variables was linear through the age of puberty (15 years of age), after which it became much more variable. The results of the study supported the notion that the Critical Period Hypothesis could apply to the acquisition of both an L1 and an L2.

Birdsong and Molis (2001) replicated Johnson and Newport’s (1989) seminal study, using the same materials and procedures as the original investigation. The main difference in the two studies was the participants’ country of origin. Johnson and Newport investigated the effects of age of arrival on a sample of Korean and Chinese natives, whereas Birdsong and Molis
investigated the effects of age of arrival on a sample of Spanish natives. Like the previous researchers, Birdsong and Molis found that overall L2 attainment negatively correlated with the participants’ age of arrival in the United States. However, they also observed some evidence of native-like L2 attainment in late arrivals (i.e., adults), which ultimately led them to reject the Critical Period Hypothesis for SLA. The existence of native-like language in some late arrivals also suggested that other variables may also play a factor in the ultimate attainment of an L2.

The purpose of DeKeyser’s (2000) study was twofold: to replicate Johnson and Newport’s (1989) study on the effects of age on SLA and to test Bley-Vroman’s (1988, 1990) Fundamental Difference Hypothesis. A sample of 57 adult immigrants to the United States participated in DeKeyser’s study, all of whom spoke Hungarian as their L1. The participants in DeKeyser’s study completed an adapted version of the grammar test that was given in Johnson and Newport’s study as well as a language learning aptitude test. The results of DeKeyser’s study supported the findings of the previous study. There was a strong, negative correlation between the participants’ age of arrival in the United States and their scores on the grammar test, with minimal overlap between the scores of the early arrivals and those of the late arrivals. The results of the study also lent support for the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis. Six out of the 42 late arrivals scored within the range of the early arrivals on the grammar test, all of whom scored above average in terms of language aptitude. These results suggest that, as proposed by Bley-Vroman (1988, 1990), critical reflection and problem-solving skills may be fundamental components of adult SLA.

Hakuta et al. (2003) offered another theory in response to the Critical Period Hypothesis. They hypothesized that the ability for people to learn or to acquire an L2 could become compromised with age due to social, educational, and cognitive factors that were not specific to
the language learning process. They proposed that although adults may have more difficulty than children in acquiring an L2, there was no set age (or critical point) at which this decline would occur. Hakuta et al. tested the Critical Period Hypothesis at two different critical points based on age (15 years and 20 years) by carefully examining regression curves for English proficiency among Spanish and Chinese immigrants to the United States. The first critical point, 15 years of age, was chosen based on Johnson and Newport’s (1989) seminal study on the effects of maturation on SLA. Unlike Johnson and Newport’s study, the results of Hakuta et al.’s study did not indicate a significant drop in L2 proficiency around either critical point; instead, L2 proficiency continued to decline into adulthood.

Although the literature surrounding age effects on SLA has been inconsistent, it is apparent that the age of acquisition of SLA has had some impact on the learners’ ability to acquire and retain an L2. Many of the previous studies have employed a proficiency test to determine the participants’ actual level of SLA (Birdsong & Molis, 2001; DeKeyser, 2000; Hakuta et al., 2003; Johnson & Newport, 1989). However, the purpose of the current study was not to determine the adult L2 learners’ actual level of SLA. Instead, this study sought to add to the literature on SLA by providing a description of the perceived experience of SLA among adult L2 learners—that is, among those L2 learners whose age of acquisition of an L2 was at least 18 years of age.

**SLA and the type of learning environment.** Another topic of interest in the literature on SLA concerns the type of learning environment in which SLA takes place. There are two primary types of learning environments for L2 study: formal (or artificial) learning environments and informal (or natural) learning environments. An FLE is a learning environment in which linguistic rules are taught in isolation and in which opportunities exist for error correction and
feedback (Krashen & Seliger, 1975). The classroom is the most common example of an FLE. In contrast, rule isolation and feedback do not appear to be present in informal learning environments (Krashen & Seliger, 1975).

Regarding the role of the learning environment on adult SLA, Krashen (2002) hypothesized that “Formal study, or its essential characteristics, is significantly more efficient than informal exposure in increasing second language proficiency in adults” (p. 41). Recent studies have also investigated the role of the learning environment on SLA, with varying results (Håkansson & Norrby, 2010; Medina & Krishnamurti, 2013; Pliatsikas & Marinis, 2013; Taguchi, 2008).

Taguchi’s (2008) study examined the role of the learning environment on the development of pragmatic L2 listening comprehension. Two groups of adult L2 learners were compared: those studying English as an L2 at a university in Japan and those studying English as an L2 at a university in the United States. Although both groups of students had formal classroom exposure to English as an L2, the group that studied in the United States also had natural exposure to the target language. The study, which had a quasi-experimental pretest/posttest design, compared the accuracy and the speed of the two groups’ responses to a computerized listening task.

The results of Taguchi’s (2008) study indicated a significant improvement in accuracy and speed over time for both groups of L2 learners. However, the magnitude of improvement for accuracy and speed was considerably different for each group. The participants who studied English as an L2 in the United States had an effect size of \( \eta^2 = 0.39 \) for response time (speed), whereas those who studied English as an L2 in Japan had a smaller effect size of \( \eta^2 = 0.15 \) for response time. The pattern of effect size was reversed for accuracy. The participants who studied
English as an L2 in the United States had an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.09$ for accuracy, whereas those who studied English as an L2 in Japan had a much larger effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.36$ for accuracy.

Håkansson and Norrby’s (2010) study also examined the role of the learning environment on SLA. The participants were 35 university students who were taking Swedish as an L2. Approximately half of the participants ($n = 18$) learned Swedish as an L2 at a university in Malmö, Sweden; the other half ($n = 17$) learned Swedish as an L2 at a university in Melbourne, Australia. Like Taguchi’s (2008) study, both groups of students had formal classroom exposure to their L2, with one group also having the opportunity to gain natural exposure to the target language. Unlike Taguchi’s study, which solely tested the L2 learners’ pragmatic listening comprehension, Håkansson and Norrby’s study investigated three distinct areas of SLA: grammar, pragmatics, and lexicon.

Håkansson and Norrby (2010) hypothesized that both pragmatic L2 development and lexical L2 development would differ between the two groups due to the type of learning environment, but grammatical L2 development would proceed similarly irrespective of the type of learning environment. The results of the study supported their hypothesis. There were no statistically significant differences in the grammatical development of the two groups; that is, both groups started with and attained approximately the same level of grammatical competency. Regarding the groups’ pragmatic development, the group that had both formal and natural exposure to the target language performed at a slightly higher level and with less individual variation than the group that had only formal exposure to the target language. Regarding the groups’ lexical development, the group that had both formal and natural exposure to the target language performed similar to those who spoke Swedish as their L1 (the control group), whereas
the group that had only formal exposure to the target language demonstrated less competency and a higher degree of variation in their responses.

Medina and Krishnamurti (2013) examined the influence of the learning environment on word recall accuracy among adult L2 learners of Spanish. The participants were eight university students, four of whom were studying abroad in Spain for a four-week mini-semester. The four participants who were studying abroad received natural exposure to the L2 in addition to formal classroom instruction in the L2. A pretest/posttest design was utilized in order to determine any differences in the two groups’ scores on word recall accuracy. Similar to Taguchi’s (2008) study, Medina and Krishnamurti found significant improvement for both groups with respect to time. However, no significant differences were found in the two groups’ word recall accuracy scores. They concluded that short-term natural exposure to the L2 does not appear to affect word recall accuracy, but recommended that the study be replicated with one group of participants receiving longer natural exposure to the L2.

Pliatsikas and Marinis’s (2013) study investigated the effect of natural exposure to the target language on L2 processing and L2 reading comprehension. The participants were 26 advanced Greek learners of L2 English with an average of nine years of natural exposure to the target language and 30 advanced Greek learners of L2 English with only formal (classroom) exposure to the target language. The control group consisted of 30 participants whose L1 was English.

The results of Pliatsikas and Marinis’s (2013) study indicated an effect for reaction time between the two experimental groups. They found that the group with natural exposure to the target language needed more time than both the control group and the other experimental group in order to complete the reading comprehension task. They also found that the group with natural
exposure to the target language converged with L1 English speakers in the manner in which they processed the information. Although the two experimental groups differed significantly with regard to L2 processing, there were no significant differences between the groups with regard to accuracy. Both experimental groups scored high on the test; in fact, they outperformed the control group in terms of accuracy. Mean accuracy scores were 78% for the group with natural exposure to L2 English, 72.3% for the group with formal exposure to L2 English, and 71.6% for the L1 English speakers.

The results of these studies provide a basis for the current study on the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE. It is apparent that adults are able to acquire certain skills in an L2 through exclusively formal exposure to the target language. However, these learners’ SLA was examined through listening, reading, or writing proficiency tests (Håkansson & Norrby, 2010; Medina & Krishnamurti, 2013; Pliatsikas & Marinis, 2013; Taguchi, 2008) and not through the learners’ perceptions of the experience. The current study aimed to provide a more in-depth understanding of the process of adult SLA in terms of the formal classroom experience by describing the L2 learners’ perceived experiences of the phenomenon.

**Studies on Personality Type**

A thorough examination of the literature on personality type (and MBTI personality type, in particular) was also completed. This search revealed numerous studies involving either adult academic achievement or adult language learning strategies. These factors will be discussed separately in this literature review.

**Personality type and adult academic achievement.** The academic achievement of adult learners in an FLE has typically been attributed to intelligence (Furnham, 2012); however,
personality type may also contribute. One study investigated the relationship between personality type and psychometric intelligence in adult learners (Furnham, Moutafi, & Paltiel, 2005). Several others explored a relationship between personality type and academic achievement in adult learners (Al Tayer, 2007; Ayoubi & Ustwani, 2014; Emerson & Taylor, 2007; Oswick & Barber, 1998; Ru, Shou-qin, & Jian-quan, 2007). One study specifically explored the relationship between personality type and academic achievement in an L2 course (Al Tayer, 2007). Most of these studies focused on type dynamics and on the interactions among the different dichotomies of personality type (Ayoubi & Ustwani, 2014; Emerson & Taylor, 2007; Oswick & Barber, 1998; Ru et al., 2007). However, Furnham et al.’s (2005) study concentrated only on the specific dimensions of Jungian personality type: extraversion (E) or introversion (I), sensing (S) or intuition (N), thinking (T) or feeling (F), and judging (J) or perceiving (P).

Furnham et al. (2005) investigated the extent to which the dimensions of personality type were related to psychometric intelligence. A total of 4,547 participants were included in the study. The participants’ dimensions of personality type were determined by their responses on the Jung Type Indicator, and the participants’ psychometric intelligence was determined by their scores on the General Reasoning Test Battery. The results indicated a statistically significant correlation between General Intelligence and all four dimensions of personality type, with introverted types, intuitive types, thinking types, and perceiving types having the greatest advantage. Regression analyses revealed that the extraversion-introversion, thinking-feeling, and judging-perceiving dimensions could all be used to predict scores in numerical, verbal, and abstract reasoning; however, the sensing-intuition dimension could only be used to predict scores in verbal reasoning.
Ayoubi and Ustwani (2014) studied 89 students from a Syrian university in order to determine whether a correlation existed between the students’ personality type, their level of enthusiasm for studying, and their academic achievement. The students’ personality type was determined by their responses to the MBTI, the students’ level of enthusiasm for studying was determined by their responses on a specially-designed questionnaire, and the students’ academic achievement was determined by their overall grade point average. Ayoubi and Ustwani found that students with INTJ and ENFJ personality types had higher overall grade point averages than students with other personality types. At the dichotomy level, a statistically significant correlation was found between the judging-perceiving dichotomy and an overall enthusiasm for studying. More judging types than perceiving types indicated either neutrality or an enthusiasm for studying. A strong correlation was also found between the sensing-intuition dichotomy and grade point average. Intuitive types achieved higher overall grade point averages than sensing types.

Other studies explored relationships between adult learners’ personality type and their academic achievement in a specific course, with mixed results. Oswick and Barber (1998) explored the relationship between personality type and academic achievement in an introductory-level accounting course at a British university. A total of 344 undergraduates were classified into three categories (“top performers,” “moderate performers,” and “poor performers”) based on their overall grade in the course. Personality type was determined by the participants’ responses on the MBTI. Oswick and Barber hypothesized that STJs would perform better than NFPs in the accounting course; however, this hypothesis was not supported by the results of their study. In fact, no significant relationships were found between the participants’ MBTI personality types and their level of achievement in the course. The main conclusion that could be drawn from
Oswick and Barber’s study was that personality type did not appear to have any relationship with academic achievement in the context of an introductory-level accounting course. However, similar studies need to be completed in other courses (including language-based courses) in order to determine if the effect of personality type varies based on the type of course.

In their correlational study on personality type and student achievement in an undergraduate level pharmacy course, Ru et al. (2007) found that the dimensions of introversion (I) and judging (J) were both significantly and positively correlated with academic achievement, while the dimensions of extraversion (E) and perceiving (P) were significantly and negatively correlated with academic achievement in the course. Several interaction effects were also found. Those participants with IJ, SJ, ST, and IS personality types had the highest grades in the pharmacy course, whereas those participants with EP, ES, and SF personality types were more likely to have low grades or to become dropouts. Like Oswick and Barber’s (1998) study, however, it is important for Ru et al.’s study to be replicated in the context of other, language-based courses.

Emerson and Taylor (2007) sought to determine if any differences in the students’ academic achievement in an undergraduate economics classroom were driven by differences in personality types as defined by the MBTI. They found that intuitive types outperformed sensing types on a posttest; however, no patterns emerged from any of the other dichotomies of personality type. Using a quasi-experimental approach, they also sought to examine the effectiveness of using experimental methods as opposed to traditional methods of instruction. They found some interaction effects for personality type with regard to method of instruction. Although they found that the experiential approach to teaching undergraduate economics benefits most MBTI personality types, ESTJs and ISTJs actually benefited more from traditional
classroom settings. This study was unique in that it provided more insight into adult learners’ preferences for the formal learning experience. Although the study was completed in an undergraduate-level economics class, replication studies in undergraduate-level L2 classes could provide some insight into whether these same personality types (ESTJs and ISTJs) would also prefer a more traditional classroom setting for their experience of SLA.

Al Tayer (2007) investigated the relationship between personality type and academic achievement among 76 university students learning Arabic as an L2. For this study, personality type was defined by the participants’ responses to the MBTI. Academic achievement was based on the participants’ total final examination scores as well as on their final composition scores. Several significant relationships were found between academic achievement and certain dichotomies of the MBTI, as well as between academic achievement and specific personality types.

A significant positive correlation was found between the extraversion-introversion dichotomy and academic achievement, as well as between the sensing-intuition dichotomy and academic achievement. Most extraverted types (92%) received a high score (at least 80%) on the total final examination, and no extraverted types received a failing score (below 60%) on the total final examination (Al Tayer, 2007). In addition, most intuitive types (85%) received a high score on the final examination, while no intuitive type failed. Similar results were found between the extraversion-introversion dichotomy and final composition scores and between the sensing-intuition dichotomy and final composition scores. Most extraverted types (80%) received an average or high score (at least 70%) on the composition, whereas the majority of introverted types (58%) had a weak or failing score (below 70%) on the composition. In addition, most intuitive types (78%) scored at least a 70% on the composition.
Significant relationships were also found between academic achievement in the course and specific personality types. On the total final examination, ENTJs and ENTPs received the highest scores; whereas ISTJs, ISTPs, and ISFPs received the weakest scores (Al Tayer, 2007). On the final composition, ENTPs, ENFPs, ESFPs, and INTJs received the highest scores; whereas ISFJs, ISTJs, INFJs, and ISFPs received the weakest scores. One personality type (ENTP) was found to score high on both the total final examination and on the final composition. Two personality types (ISTJs and ISFPs) were found to have weak scores on both assessments. Al Tayer recommended that replication and comparative studies should be done in order to determine whether the same conclusions would be transferrable to participants in other institutions.

One important factor must be considered when analyzing the varying results of these studies in the context of the current study. All of these studies explored the role of personality type on academic achievement in an FLE. They explored the role of personality type in a variety of subject areas; however, only Al Tayer’s (2007) study explored the role of personality type within the context of an L2 course. To better understand the influence of personality type on the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners, more research of this kind must be completed in the formal L2 classroom environment.

**Personality type and language learning strategies.** Very few studies have investigated the influence of personality type either on academic achievement in an L2 or on SLA. However, SLA success has been associated with language learning strategies, and sporadic attention has been paid to the link between personality type and language learning strategies (Kayaoğlu, 2013). Language learning strategies are defined as “skills, tactics, and approaches which learners adopt when dealing with language learning . . . conscious decisions made by learners’ [sic] to
enhance learning” (Sharp, 2006, p. 32). Language learning strategies can be either directly or indirectly related to the target language. Direct language learning strategies include those strategies that involve the processes of memory, cognition, and compensation; indirect language learning strategies include those strategies that involve the processes of metacognition, affect, and socialization (Sharp, 2006).

Ehrman and Oxford’s (1989) correlational study on the relationship between adult L2 learners’ personality types and their language learning strategies has been among the most influential in the field of linguistics. The MBTI was used to determine the adult L2 learners’ personality types. A preliminary factor analysis based on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning questionnaire yielded 10 factors or strategies that the adult L2 learners used to help them learn the target language: general learning strategies, authentic language use, searching for and communicating meaning, independent strategies, memory strategies, social strategies, affective strategies, self-management, visualization strategies, and formal model-building strategies.

Ehrman and Oxford (1989) found several significant relationships between the dichotomies of personality type and these 10 language learning strategies. With respect to the extraversion-introversion dichotomy, Ehrman and Oxford found that extraverted types were more likely than introverted types to use affective and visualization strategies; however, introverted types were more likely to search for and communicate meaning. Regarding the sensing-intuition dichotomy, Ehrman and Oxford found that intuitive types were more likely than sensing types to search for and communicate meaning, to use formal model-building strategies, to use affective strategies, and to employ authentic language use. Regarding the thinking-feeling dichotomy, Ehrman and Oxford found that feeling types were more likely than
thinking types to employ general learning strategies. Regarding the judging-perceiving dichotomy, Ehrman and Oxford found that although judging types employed more general learning strategies, perceiving types were more likely to search for and communicate meaning in context.

Ehrman and Oxford (1989) also explored the interaction effects among the different MBTI dichotomies as they related to language learning strategies. They found that EN types employed significantly more memory strategies than ES, IN, and IS types. General study strategies were employed significantly more frequently among NJ types than SP types, among FJ types than TP types, and among EJ types than IP types. Strategies for searching and communicating meaning were significantly more common among NJ types and NP types than SJ types, among FP types than TJ types, among IP types than EJ types, and among IN types than ES types. Participants with EN types employed more affective strategies than those with IS types, and they employed more visualization strategies than those with IN types. Although interaction effects were found, no single personality type was found to be the most effective at using language learning strategies.

Using a decidedly humanistic approach, Sharp (2006) expanded upon the previous research on personality types and language learning strategies. He further examined the relationship between these two variables, while also exploring their link to SLL success. The participants in Sharp’s study were 100 undergraduates, all of whom spoke Chinese as their L1 and English as their L2. Reminiscent of Ehrman and Oxford’s (1989) study, Sharp employed the MBTI to determine the participants’ personality types and the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning to determine the participants’ preferred language learning strategies. The participants’
SLL success was determined by their composite scores of grammar and reading on a standardized English language proficiency test.

In contrast to Ehrman and Oxford’s (1989) study, the results of Sharp’s (2006) study indicated no significant relationships between the participants’ language learning strategies and their personality types, with the exception of the extraversion-introversion dichotomy. Introverted types were found to be negatively correlated with the use of social skills and positively correlated with the use of metacognitive strategies (Sharp, 2006). No significant relationship was found between any of the language learning strategies and SLL success. The results of the study also did not reveal a significant relationship between personality type and SLL success, although Sharp noted slightly higher L2 proficiency scores for introverted types than for extraverted types.

Chen and Hung (2012) also extended the previous research on personality type and language learning strategies. They studied 364 students in Taiwan who were taking English as an L2 to determine whether a correlation existed among the different dichotomies of personality type (as measured by the MBTI), the students’ language learning strategy preferences, and the students’ perceptual learning style preferences.

The results of Chen and Hung’s (2012) study were found to be inconsistent with the results of both Ehrman and Oxford’s (1989) study and Sharp’s (2006) study. Chen and Hung found a significant relationship between three of the four dichotomies of personality type and the students’ language learning strategy preferences. With respect to the extraversion-introversion dichotomy, Chen and Hung found that extraverted types employed significantly more compensation, metacognitive, cognitive, memory, affective, and social strategies than introverted types. With respect to the sensing-intuition dichotomy, Chen and Hung found that intuitive types
employed more memory, compensation, metacognitive, and social strategies than sensing types. With respect to the judging-perceiving dichotomy, Chen and Hung found that judging types employed more metacognitive, cognitive, and social strategies than perceiving types. No significant relationship was found between the thinking-feeling dichotomy and language learning strategies. In addition, the results of Chen and Hung’s study indicated no significant differences between any of the dichotomies of personality type and the students’ perceptual learning style preferences.

Some studies specifically explored the relationship between the four distinct dichotomies of personality type and the use of language learning strategies (Chen & Hung, 2012; Sharp, 2006). Still others noted the importance of type dynamics on personality type, and delved deeper to determine how the interactions of the different MBTI dichotomies related to the use of language learning strategies (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989). Many recent studies, however, have tended to focus on the extraversion-introversion dichotomy of personality type to the exclusion of the others (Fayyaz & Kamal, 2011; Kayaoğlu, 2013; Natsumi, 2000). In order to understand more about how adult L2 learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA, it was important for the current study to address all four dichotomies of personality type as well as type dynamics.

**Summary**

Two of the most explored facets of SLA are the age of acquisition and the type of learning environment in which SLA takes place. The results of numerous studies have indicated that the younger the learners are, the better their chances are of acquiring an L2 (Birdsong & Molis, 2001; DeKeyser, 2000; Hakuta et al., 2003; Johnson & Newport, 1989). However, studies have also shown that it is possible for adult learners to acquire near-native attainment in their L2
(Birdsong & Molis, 2001). It is also apparent that adult learners are able to gain these L2 skills through exclusively formal exposure to the target language; that is, natural exposure to the L2 is not a requirement for SLA (Håkansson & Norrby, 2010; Medina & Krishnamurti, 2013; Pliatsikas & Marinis, 2013; Taguchi, 2008). Knowles’ theory of andragogy (1970) and Krashen’s Monitor Theory of SLA (2002, 2009) provide a basis for understanding the processes by which adults either learn or acquire an L2. However, no study was found that provides an in-depth description of what the experience of SLA means for adult L2 learners in an FLE. The current study aimed to add to the literature on adult SLA by describing the perceived experience of SLA for these learners.

In addition, much still needs to be learned regarding individual differences in the process of adult SLA. Individual difference variables such as language aptitude, language learning motivation, language learning strategies, and learning styles have been researched on several occasions (Dixon et al., 2012; Dörnyei, 2010; Drożdżal-Szelest & Pawlak, 2012; Engin, 2009; Erton, 2010; Skehan, 2014; Young-Gyo, 2013). However, few studies have researched the influence of personality type on SLA. The studies that have linked the processes of adult SLL and adult SLA to personality type have mostly focused on the extraversion-introversion dichotomy of personality type (Fayyaz & Kamal, 2011; Kayaoğlu, 2013; Natsumi, 2000). However, there is a need to explore how other dichotomies associated with personality type may also influence the experience of SLA for these learners. The current study aimed to address this gap in the literature by describing how adult L2 learners in an FLE perceived that their personality type—including the interaction of the different dichotomies—either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

This chapter begins with the presentation of the research design along with the six research subquestions that guided the current study. The setting for the study is also described. A thorough description of the sampling procedures, along with the sample size, is also provided. The data collection procedures and the data analysis procedures that were used in the study are then explained in detail. Trustworthiness and ethical considerations are also discussed in this chapter. To maintain confidentiality, pseudonyms have been used to replace the names of all participants and institutions in the study.

This hermeneutic phenomenological study sought to address two needs: (a) a better understanding of the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA, and (b) a better understanding of how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA. The purpose of this study was to describe the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA and to describe how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA.

Design

In order to choose among the various approaches to educational research, Shulman (1988) advised educational researchers to (a) understand the problem they wish to address, (b) decide what questions they wish to ask, and (c) select the mode of disciplined inquiry most appropriate to the questions they want to ask. Based on the problem of the study and the questions that I wanted to be answered, I conducted the study using qualitative research methods and a hermeneutic phenomenological design.
The qualitative approach to inquiry was more appropriate than the quantitative approach because I wanted to obtain an in-depth understanding of the research problem. I used multiple methods for collecting data: semi-structured interviews, open-ended journal entries, and two semi-structured focus groups. Creswell (2013) indicated that a phenomenological design is appropriate whenever the focus of the research is to understand the essence of an experience. A phenomenological design was the most suitable design for this study because the study sought to describe the essence of the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE. The hermeneutic method refers to an interpretive approach in which understanding the meaning of the whole and understanding the meaning of its parts are interdependent activities (Schwandt, 2007). In order to understand the entirety of the meaning of the experience of SLA and how it was influenced by personality type, each part must be viewed separately: the age of acquisition, the type of learning environment, and the personality type of the learners. In addition, how the learners experienced SLA had the ability to influence their perception of the age of acquisition, the type of learning environment, and their personality type. Personality type is the area that has received the least amount of attention in the field of SLA; therefore, it was the focus of the current study. Because this study employed a hermeneutic phenomenological design, the perceived experiences of SLA were analyzed using van Manen’s (1990) phenomenological reflection.

**Research Questions**

This hermeneutic phenomenological study was guided by the central research question: What is the essence of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA? The central question was also divided into six subquestions:
RQ1: How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the beginning of an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ2: In what ways do these learners anticipate that their personality type will either enhance or inhibit their experience of SLA?

RQ3: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA as they progress through an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ4: How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ5: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ6: In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

Setting

The setting for this study was CCVA (pseudonym), a medium-sized community college in Virginia with campuses in multiple locations. In addition, some courses taught through CCVA are taught in an online format. CCVA was chosen as the setting for the study because it is typical of many community colleges in the state. The student population is approximately 60% female and 40% male, with a majority of its students identifying as either Caucasian/not Hispanic (51%) or African-American/not Hispanic (36%, Virginia Community College System, 2015). CCVA caters to part-time students, with 74% of its students enrolling only part-time (Virginia Community College System, 2015).
CCVA has several programs from which to choose. Students can enroll in freshman or sophomore-level courses in order to graduate with an associate’s degree. Some students enroll in these classes with the intention of transferring to a four-year university after obtaining their associate’s degree. Other students enroll in lower-level courses to investigate new careers, to get job training, or to obtain a technical certificate. The focus of this study was on an introductory-level Spanish course, or a first-year, first-semester L2 course. Because CCVA had many course offerings for introductory-level Spanish, it was believed to be a good setting for the study.

The data collection process involved several different locations, both on and off of the CCVA campuses. The preliminary questionnaire, the MBTI Complete, and the journaling were all completed online or via e-mail. The online access to these instruments allowed the participants to complete these activities privately and asynchronously. The interviews and the focus groups took place in the group study rooms at the on-campus libraries. The group study rooms, which were both private and quiet, were the most appropriate locations for the nature of these data collection methods.

**Participants**

According to Patton (2002), “The logic and power of purposeful sampling … leads to selecting *information-rich cases* for study in depth” (p. 46). There are numerous methods for purposefully selecting participants; however, criterion sampling was the most appropriate method to use for this hermeneutic phenomenological study. Criterion sampling allows for the identification of all participants who have met certain criteria (or who have experienced a certain phenomenon) based upon the responses to a questionnaire (Patton, 2002). This method is also useful for meeting the need of quality assurance (Creswell, 2013; Patton, 2002).
For the current study, I employed a criterion sampling procedure to secure six participants for an in-depth study of their perceived experience of SLA. For phenomenological studies, there is no true lower limit for sample size, and the upper limit is based strictly on the procedures involved in completing the research (Dukes, 1984; Patton, 2002). Dukes (1984) maintains that the “Invariants [of an experience] are fully discoverable in any individual case . . . [but] it is wise to expand the sample to three, five, or perhaps even ten subjects” (p. 200). Therefore, a total sample size of six participants allowed me to explore a range of personality types while still being able to describe each of the participants’ perceived experiences of SLA in great depth.

The participants for this study were recruited over the course of two 16-week semesters: Semester A and Semester B. In order to solicit participants, the authorities at CCVA sent a recruitment e-mail (see Appendix A) at the beginning of the second week of each semester to all students who were enrolled in an introductory-level Spanish course. For the purposes of this study, an introductory-level Spanish course was defined as a first-year, first-semester Spanish course. At the beginning of Semester A, the recruitment e-mail was sent out to 348 students. At the beginning of Semester B, the same recruitment e-mail was sent out to 257 students. In total, 605 students who were enrolled in an introductory-level Spanish course at CCVA were invited to participate in the study. During Semester B, the authorities at CCVA sent out a second recruitment e-mail at the end of the third week of the semester. This e-mail provided the students taking an introductory-level Spanish course with a second chance to participate in the study if they had not already elected to participate.

The recruitment e-mail included the rationale for the study as well as a description of the study. A letter of informed consent to participate in the study (see Appendix B) was also attached
to the e-mail. The letter of informed consent informed the prospective participants of the types of activities that would be required for participation in the study, of the option to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, and of the compensation they would receive for their participation in the study. Prospective participants who were eligible for the study and who chose to participate received a $10 gas card. They were also entered into a drawing for a chance to win a $100 gift card to CCVA’s bookstore. All compensation was given out at the completion of the study.

In the recruitment e-mail, prospective participants were asked to sign and return a hard copy of the letter of informed consent to the professor of their introductory-level Spanish course. All professors who had received letters of informed consent from prospective participants were asked to e-mail me during the third week of the semester in order to arrange a time to hand-deliver the letters to me. However, some of the introductory-level Spanish courses were taught in an online format, making it difficult for the prospective participants to hand their letters of informed consent to their professor. In addition, the introductory-level Spanish course was taught by 10 professors on three different campuses. For these reasons, the authorities at CCVA encouraged those who were interested in the study to contact me via e-mail in order to arrange a time for me to pick up the letters of informed consent directly from them.

Over the course of two semesters, a total of 16 students (three from Semester A and 13 from Semester B) showed interest in the study, either by turning in the letter of informed consent to their professor or by e-mailing me directly to arrange a time to return the letter of informed consent to me. I responded to each e-mail of interest within 24 hours, giving the interested students a range of times in which I would be available to meet. In my response e-mails, I also encouraged the interested students to remind their classmates about the study. In the event that
no arrangements were made to meet within five to seven days of my original e-mail, I sent out a
second e-mail to confirm interest in the study as well as to confirm the intention to return the
test of informed consent to me.

Over the course of the two semesters, 10 out of the 16 interested students (two from
Semester A and eight from Semester B) had consented to participate, and were therefore
considered to be prospective participants in the study. I was unable to consider the other six
students to be prospective participants because although they were originally thought to be
interested in the study, they chose not to submit the letter of informed consent. Once I received a
letter of informed consent from a prospective participant, I issued him or her a unique
confirmation number as well as the pseudonym that would be used for the remainder of the
study.

Nine out of the 10 prospective participants returned the preliminary questionnaire (see
Appendix C) to me via e-mail by the end of the fourth week of their introductory-level Spanish
course. The other prospective participant did not return the preliminary questionnaire, and did
not respond to my e-mail attempt to receive it. Therefore, he became ineligible to continue
participating in the study. The preliminary questionnaire took approximately 5-10 minutes to
complete, and it was used to determine the prospective participants’ initial eligibility for the
study based on the following criteria:

- prospective participants were at least 18 years of age, and
- prospective participants spoke English as their L1.

One prospective participant became ineligible to participate based on the criteria on the
preliminary questionnaire. The eight remaining prospective participants who were initially
eligible based on the above criteria were e-mailed a link to my SkillsOne website, where they
were asked to take the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire under their given pseudonym. The MBTI Complete took approximately 45-60 minutes, and it did not have to be completed in one sitting. In order to remain eligible for the study, the prospective participants were required to submit the MBTI Complete by the end of the fourth week of their introductory-level Spanish course. Two of the prospective participants did not submit their MBTI Complete personality questionnaire within this time frame, despite multiple e-mail attempts to remind them. Therefore, they were considered to be ineligible to participate further in the study. The online format of the MBTI Complete combines the MBTI Step I (Form M) questionnaire with an interactive interpretation that is endorsed by the Myers and Briggs Foundation (CPP Inc., 2009). The MBTI Step I (Form M) is a self-report questionnaire that comprises 93 forced-choice items (see Appendix D for sample items). The MBTI Complete personality questionnaire identified the prospective participants’ preferences on each of the four dichotomies of personality type (extraversion-introversion, sensing-intuition, thinking-feeling, and judging-perceiving), resulting in a four-letter combination that represented their personality type (e.g., ISTJ, ENFP). Once the prospective participants completed the interactive personality interpretation, they received their individualized MBTI profile and type description via e-mail.

Criterion sampling requires the use of all cases (or participants) that meet the predetermined criteria for the study (Patton, 2002). The initial eligibility criteria for this study required participants to be at least 18 years of age and to speak English as their L1. In order to answer any of the research questions for this study, however, participants would also need to complete, at minimum, both the MBTI Complete and the first interview for the study. These would need to have been completed before the end of the fifth week of the introductory-level Spanish course in order to provide credible results for the first two research questions. Based on
these requirements, a total of six participants (one from Semester A and five from Semester B) were eligible for participation in the study. A summary of the eligibility status of the prospective participants is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirmation number</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A01</td>
<td>Ashley A.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A02</td>
<td>Brandon A.</td>
<td>No(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B01</td>
<td>Carl B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B02</td>
<td>Danielle B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B03</td>
<td>Evelyn B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B04</td>
<td>Fiona B.</td>
<td>No(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B05</td>
<td>Gary B.</td>
<td>No(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B06</td>
<td>Hannah B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B07</td>
<td>Isabel B.</td>
<td>No(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B08</td>
<td>Jacqueline B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \(^a\)Did not meet the criteria for the study based on the Preliminary Questionnaire. \(^b\)Did not submit the MBTI Complete. \(^c\)Did not return the Preliminary Questionnaire.

Of the six participants that were eligible for the study, five were female and one was male. Three participants identified as Caucasian, two participants identified as African-American, and one participant identified as a mix of Caucasian and Asian. The ages of the six participants ranged from 20 to 47 years.
The six participants also varied in terms of their previous L2 learning experiences. One participant had never been previously exposed to an L2 in an FLE. For three of the participants, it had been at least 10 years since their last L2 learning experience in an FLE. Two of the participants had an L2 learning experience in an FLE within the past five years.

The participants also differed in terms of their personality types. Six different MBTI personality types were featured in this study: ISTP, ISFP, INFP, ESFP, ESFJ, and ENFP.

**Procedures**

Before collecting any data for this study, I submitted an application for research approval to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Liberty University as well as to the Department of Policy and Institutional Effectiveness at CCVA. Submitting an application to an IRB is an essential step in the research process because it ensures the protection of the human participants in a study (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). No data were collected until after I had final approval from both the Liberty University IRB (see Appendix E) and from the authorities at CCVA (see Appendix F). The instructors of the introductory-level Spanish courses were contacted via e-mail so they could be made aware of the intent and the rationale of the study. The instructors were also asked to collect the letters of informed consent from the prospective participants and to e-mail me to arrange a time to hand-deliver the letters to me. Because all the data collection was conducted outside of the classroom setting, however, it was not necessary to seek instructor approval for the data collection itself.

Once I had been given permission to conduct my research by the IRB at Liberty University and by the Department of Institutional Effectiveness at CCVA, I began to solicit participants for the study. In order to secure a sufficient number of participants, the study was conducted over the course of two semesters (Semester A and Semester B). Using the method of
criterion sampling, a total of six participants (one from Semester A and five from Semester B) were secured for an in-depth study of their perceived experiences of SLA. The six participants varied in terms of their level of participation in the study; however, it was important to collect as much data as possible from each of the six participants.

The data in this study were collected through a series of semi-structured interviews, open-ended journal entries, and semi-structured focus groups. The interview and focus group data were recorded and transcribed. Finally, the data were analyzed using van Manen’s (1990) phenomenological reflection.

**The Researcher’s Role**

Qualitative researchers must establish reflexivity, defined by Schwandt (2007) as “the process of critical self-reflection on one’s biases, theoretical predispositions, preferences, and so forth” (p. 260). This process includes the revelation of the researcher’s own past experiences with the phenomenon of interest as well as a discussion about how these experiences shape the researcher’s interpretation of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). As the researcher in this hermeneutic phenomenological qualitative study, I need to present my background experience in the form of a personal biography. I also took the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire in order to determine my own personality type. Doing so has allowed me to bracket out my own perceptions of how my personality type has influenced my experience of SLA.

I would describe my own experience of SLA as very successful. I am able to read, write, and speak in my L2 with a significant degree of fluency and understanding. At times, I have even found it easier or more meaningful to communicate in my L2 rather than in my L1. My experience acquiring an L2 began in the seventh grade, through formal instruction in the Spanish language. I continued to take Spanish classes in an FLE throughout high school. As a freshman
at a four-year university, I took a single semester off before I restarted taking Spanish classes in an FLE. My undergraduate studies also included a study abroad experience, which allowed me to have both formal and natural exposure to my L2. The age at which I began to acquire my L2 may have influenced how well I was able to acquire it, and my study abroad experience also may have played an important role in my experience of SLA.

However, I would describe my experience acquiring a third language (L3) as unsuccessful, because I can neither speak nor write in the target language. At most, I can identify random words out of context. My experience trying to acquire an L3 began at the university level, after taking several L2 classes in an FLE. I enrolled in an introductory-level (first year, first semester) Italian course. However, I was unable to enroll in the second semester of the course due to my study abroad experience the following semester. Upon my return, I enrolled in an intermediate-level (second year) Italian course. My grades and scores on classroom tests all seemed to indicate that I had learned the target language, but I still could not communicate in it. Therefore, my experience at acquiring an L3 could be described as unsuccessful. My experience trying to learn another language as an adult as well as my own interpretation of the experience could have influenced how I analyzed the data in this study. I had to be aware of these possible biases and bracket out these experiences as I analyzed the participants’ perceived experiences of SLA.

My experience teaching an L2 could also have influenced my data analysis. I have taught Spanish at the secondary level of instruction for a total of 11 years. In this time, I have taught both introductory-level (first-year) Spanish courses as well as intermediate-level (second-year) Spanish courses. My aspiration, however, is to teach at the university level. My decision to conduct a study at the community college was a result of my interest in andragogy. I could have
had a tendency to analyze the data for this hermeneutic phenomenological study according to my previous L2 teaching experiences. As part of my data analysis, I attempted to set these experiences aside in order to view the data from an adult learning perspective. By doing so, I was able to develop a better understanding of how adult L2 learners perceived their experience of SLA.

My analysis for this study could also have been influenced by my own beliefs about how personality type can enhance or inhibit the experience of SLA. In order to bracket out these beliefs, I needed to take the MBTI Complete questionnaire to determine my own personality type. According to the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire, my reported personality type is ISTJ. My dominant function is introverted sensing, and my auxiliary function is extraverted thinking. According to Myers (1998), ISTJs are likely to be practical, sensible, realistic, systematic, logical, analytical, detached, and reasonable. ISTJs take in information through their five senses, and use this information to make objective, logical decisions. ISTJs get their energy from the inner world of ideas, and have a need for structure and order. I would agree that ISTJ is my best-fit personality type. I feel more energized when I am reflecting alone than when I am talking with other people. I prefer concrete facts over abstract ideas, and my decisions are both objective and methodical. Because I was able to acquire my L2 rather easily, I thought that none of those four preferences—introversion, sensing, thinking, or judging—would inhibit SLA in and of itself. However, I also thought that type dynamics and the interplay between the four preferences could also have played a part in my experience of SLA. Either way, it was important for me to bracket out my own perceived experiences in order to focus my attention on the perceived experiences of the participants in this study.
Data Collection

Data triangulation, or the use of a variety of data sources (Patton, 2002), was used in order to strengthen my study and to make it more credible. I achieved data triangulation by collecting data through semi-structured interviews, open-ended journal entries, and semi-structured focus groups. A primary interview was conducted with all six participants before the end of the fifth week of their introductory-level Spanish course. Journal prompts were given to the participants during the seventh, the eleventh, and the fifteenth week of their introductory-level Spanish course. Four participants completed all three journal entries. A fifth participant completed the first two journal entries, but did not have time to complete the third entry before the end of her introductory-level Spanish course. A final interview was conducted with five of the participants after the completion of their introductory-level Spanish course. Two focus groups consisting of two participants each were also conducted after the completion of the introductory-level Spanish course, following the participants’ final interviews.

To ensure the clarity of the questions, the two interview guides, the journal prompt, and the focus group prompts were reviewed by an external advisor prior to data collection. The advisor was someone with experience and expertise in qualitative research and interview methods. The interview questions and the focus group prompts were also piloted with a small sample outside of the participants for this study.

Interviews

The first point of data collection for this study was the use of two semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews “involve asking a series of structured questions and then probing more deeply with open-form questions to obtain additional information” (Gall et al., 2007, p. 246).
Primary interview. A primary semi-structured interview was conducted with all six participants by the end of the fifth week of their introductory-level Spanish course. Each of these interviews was conducted in person in a group study room at a CCVA library. The interviews ranged in length from 23 minutes 45 seconds to 47 minutes 24 seconds, with an average length of 32 minutes 9 seconds. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed before any of the data were analyzed. Glesne (2006) suggested using two tape recorders in different locations in order to pick up soft voices as well as to have a backup copy of the recording. Therefore, the interviews were audio-recorded using both an iPhone 5c and a Sony digital voice recorder. Audio-recording the interviews ensured the accuracy of my transcriptions. Patton (2002) advised that the use of a recording device does not eliminate the need for taking notes; however, it does provide the interviewer with the ability to concentrate on taking strategic and focused notes for future questions and analysis. During each primary interview, I took notes using an interview guide (see Appendix G) with the intent to gather background information on the participants and to answer the following subquestions:

RQ1. How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the beginning of an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ2. In what ways do these learners anticipate that their personality type will either enhance or inhibit their experience of SLA?

Seven questions were asked during the primary interview. When necessary, probe questions (see Appendix G) were also used. Asking probe questions allows the interviewer to delve deeper into the participants’ responses (Patton, 2002). The following seven questions were asked of each participant during the primary interview:
1. This will be the first of two interviews for this study, and it will also serve as the method for interpreting your Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) results. It will be audio-recorded for accuracy; is that OK?

2. Tell me a little about yourself.

3. This study is about second language acquisition. In everyday terms, this can be described as “picking up a second language.” What does this mean to you, as a student who just started taking an introductory-level Spanish class?

4. This study also addresses the role of personality type in picking up a second language. How would you describe your personality type?

5. How do you think your personality type will either help you or hinder you from “picking up” Spanish?

6. Overall, do you think you will be at an advantage or at a disadvantage for “picking up” Spanish, as compared to other adults who are taking an introductory-level Spanish course?

7. Is there anything else you want to share with me either about your personality type or about your upcoming experience taking a foreign language class?

Question one ensured that the participants were aware that their responses would be audio-recorded and that they had given their consent to proceed with the interview. It also briefed the participants on another purpose of the interview: it would serve as a personalized interpretation of their results on the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire.

Question two served as an icebreaker, which allowed me to get to know the participant in a more general sense. It also provided some important information about the demographics for
this study. Background questions are standard in qualitative interviews, because they allow the interviewer to locate the respondent in relation to other participants in the study (Patton, 2002).

Question three was developed in order to get some insight into how the participants would describe the meaning of SLA at the beginning of their introductory-level Spanish course. Although it was important for the participants to describe the meaning of SLA in their own words, I provided them with Krashen’s (2009) simplified definition, “‘picking-up’ a language” (p. 10). This enabled the participants to have a basis on which to structure their opinion of the meaning of SLA.

Question four served as an additional icebreaker question because it allowed me to get to know the participants better. However, it was also used as a transition to the interpretation of the participants’ MBTI Complete results. This was necessary because the ethical guidelines for MBTI practitioners dictate that every client who completes an MBTI instrument must not only receive an interactive explanation of their preferences, but must also verify these results (CPP Inc., 2011).

Questions five and six were developed in order to get some insight into how the participants would anticipate that their personality type would influence their experience of SLA. Question five targeted specific aspects of MBTI personality type (e.g., extraversion or introversion), whereas question six allowed the participants to have the opportunity to discuss the influence of their personality type in a much broader sense. In doing so, the participants provided me with information regarding the role of type dynamics—how the four mental functions interact (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014)—on their anticipated experience of SLA.

Question seven provided the participants with a final opportunity to discuss either their personality type or their anticipated experience of SLA. I added this question at the end of the
interview because Patton (2002) suggested that allowing the interviewees to have the final say can lead to some of the richest and most unexpected data.

**Final interview.** A final semi-structured interview was conducted with five participants after the completion of their introductory-level Spanish course. The interviews were conducted in person in a group study room at a CCVA library. The interviews ranged in length from 10 minutes 48 seconds to 22 minutes 21 seconds, with an average length of 15 minutes 46 seconds. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed before any of the data were analyzed. The interviews were audio-recorded using both an iPhone 5c and a Sony digital voice recorder. Audio-recording the interviews ensured the accuracy of my transcriptions. During each final interview, I took notes using an interview guide (see Appendix H) with the intent to answer the following subquestions:

**RQ4.** How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

**RQ5.** How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

**RQ6.** In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

Eight questions were asked during the final interview. When necessary, probe questions (see Appendix H) were also used. Asking probe questions allows the interviewer to delve deeper into the participants’ responses (Patton, 2002). The following eight questions were asked of each participant during the final interview:
1. This will be the second and final interview for this study. It will be audio-recorded for accuracy; is that OK?

2. Has anything changed in terms of your academic major or your degree pursuit since we last spoke?

3. Remember that this study is about second language acquisition, or the ability to “pick up” a second language. Now that you are at the end of your first semester of introductory-level Spanish, what does that mean to you?

4. Overall, how would you describe your experience in Spanish class this semester?

5. Remember that this study also addresses the role of personality type in “picking up” a second language. Has your own interpretation of your personality type changed since we last spoke?

6. How do you think your personality type either helped you or hindered you from “picking up” Spanish?

7. Overall, do you think you were at an advantage or at a disadvantage for “picking up” Spanish, as compared to other adults who were taking an introductory-level Spanish course?

8. Is there anything else you want to share with me either about your personality type or about your experience taking a foreign language class?

Question one ensured that the participants were aware that their responses would be audio-recorded and that they had given their consent to proceed with the interview.

Question two served as an icebreaker or background question. It gave the participants an opportunity to reiterate any information they felt was important, as well as to delve further into their background if necessary.
Question three was developed in order to understand how the participants described the meaning of SLA at the end of their introductory-level Spanish course. Although the participants were expected to describe SLA in their own words, I supplied them with Krashen’s (2009) simplified definition, “‘picking-up’ a language” (p. 10). In doing so, I provided the participants with a basis on which to structure their opinion of the meaning of SLA. This question was also used as a means for comparing the participants’ opinion of the meaning of SLA at the beginning of the introductory-level Spanish course with their opinion of the meaning of SLA at the end of the course.

Question four was developed in order to elicit a thorough description of how the participants experienced SLA. Although it was partially aimed at understanding the participants’ opinion of the experience, it was mostly aimed at understanding the participants’ feelings toward this experience. Patton (2002) stated that in asking feeling questions, the interviewer is looking for adjective responses. Because I was looking for a description of the participants’ experience of SLA, I needed to ask a question that would elicit descriptive (adjective) responses.

Question five served as another icebreaker or background question. It also served as a review of the participants’ personality preferences and MBTI personality type. This question was also a transition to the questions about the participants’ perception of the role that personality type played on their experience of SLA.

Questions six and seven were developed in order to understand how the participants perceived that their personality type influenced their experience of SLA. Question six targeted specific aspects of MBTI personality type (e.g., extraversion or introversion), whereas question seven allowed the participants to have the opportunity to discuss the influence of their personality type in a much broader sense. In doing so, the participants provided me with
information regarding the role of type dynamics—how the four mental functions interact (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014)—on their perceived experience of SLA.

Question eight was asked as a final or closing question. Patton (2002) suggested that these types of questions are important in formal interviews, because they provide the participants with the opportunity to have the final say, which can lead to rich data. In asking this question, I provided the participants with an open-ended opportunity to describe their perceived experience of SLA.

**Journals**

The second point of data collection for this study was the use of open-ended journal entries. Journal prompts were given to the participants during the seventh, the eleventh, and the fifteenth week of their introductory-level Spanish course. Journaling has value in phenomenological research because it provides a means by which the participants can reflect on their own experiences and begin to find relationships among these experiences (van Manen, 1990). For this study, the journal entries were electronic. At the very beginning of the study, I set up a Penzu classroom account. I sent an e-mail to each of the six participants that were eligible for the study, providing them with instructions on how to set up their free Penzu electronic journals. The participants also received a unique classroom code so they could link their own electronic journals to the Penzu classroom account designed for the study. During the seventh, the eleventh, and the fifteenth week of their introductory-level Spanish course, I sent the participants an e-mail requesting that they log in to their Penzu account, answer the open-ended journal prompt, and share the journal entry with me using the link to the Penzu classroom account. The participants reflected on their experience of SLA by answering the open-ended journal entry prompt, “Reflect on your experience in Spanish class over the past couple of
weeks. How well do you think you are ‘picking up’ the language? Explain.” The purpose of the open-ended journal entry was to understand and capture the participants’ point of view on their own terms; that is, without pre-determining their points of view (Patton, 2002). This prompt remained the same each time, with the intention of finding the answer to the third subquestion: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA as they progress through an introductory-level Spanish course?

**Focus Groups**

The third point of data collection for this study was the use of two focus groups consisting of two participants each. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2010) defined focus groups as “a form of group interview in which a number of people participate in a discussion guided by a skilled interviewer” (p. 349). According to Patton (2002), focus groups can increase the researcher’s confidence in the emerging themes. Conducting the focus groups after the participants’ final interviews had been conducted allowed me to expand upon the participants’ responses to the questions from the second interview.

The focus groups were conducted after all the final interviews had been completed. The focus groups met in person in a group study room at a CCVA library. The first focus group was 31 minutes 37 seconds in length, and the second focus group was 35 minutes 31 seconds in length. The focus groups were audio-recorded, video-recorded, and transcribed before any of the data were analyzed. The focus groups were audio-recorded and video-recorded using both an iPad mini and a Kindle Fire 6. Audio-recording the focus groups ensured the accuracy of my transcriptions. Video-recording the focus groups ensured that I attributed each response to the correct participant. During each focus group, I took notes using an interview guide (see Appendix I) with the intent to answer the following subquestions:
RQ4. How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ5. How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ6. In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

Six questions were asked during the focus groups. When necessary, probe questions (see Appendix I) were also used. Asking probe questions allows the interviewer to delve deeper into the participants’ responses (Patton, 2002). The following six questions were asked of the participants during the focus group:

1. This focus group will be both audio-recorded and video-recorded for accuracy; is that OK?

2. One at a time, please give a short description of yourself, including your academic major and your Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) personality type.

3. Remember that this study is about second language acquisition, or the ability to “pick up” a second language. Discuss what “picking up a language” means, in terms of being able to communicate in the language.

4. Discuss some of your experiences in Spanish class this semester. Overall, how well do you think you “picked up” the language?

5. Discuss the role that you think your personality played in your ability to “pick up” the language.
6. Is there anything else that you want to share or discuss about your personality type or your experience taking a foreign language class?

Question one ensured that the participants were aware that their responses would be both audio-recorded and video-recorded. It also ensured that all participants had given their consent to proceed with the focus group.

Question two served as an icebreaker or background question. Much like individual interviews, focus groups often begin with an experiential question that everyone takes turns in answering (Glesne, 2006). Because the purpose of a focus group is to promote discussion among the participants, it is important for the participants to feel comfortable talking with each other. This question not only allowed the participants to get acquainted with each other, but it also provided a review of the participants’ personality preferences and MBTI personality type.

Questions three, four, and five were all developed as discussion questions. Because a phenomenological study describes the common meaning of a lived experience for a group of individuals (Creswell, 2013), it was important to allow the participants to have the chance to discuss their lived experience of SLA in the FLE. The purpose of question three was to understand the common meaning that the participants gave to the term SLA at the end of their introductory-level Spanish course. The purpose of question four was to understand the common experience of SLA in the FLE for these participants. The purpose of question five was to understand the common perception of how the participants’ personality type had influenced their experience of SLA in the FLE.

Question six was asked as a final or closing question. Glesne (2006) stated that, at the end of a focus group session, the participants are often asked to speak individually in order to summarize their position on a topic. By asking the participants if they had anything else they
wanted to share, I allowed the participants to continue to express their beliefs on personality type, SLA, and their experience taking an L2 course in an FLE.

**Data Analysis**

Van Manen (1990) stated that “The insight into the essence of a phenomenon involves a process of reflectively appropriating, of clarifying, and of making explicit the structure of meaning of the lived experience” (p. 77). To gain insight into the phenomenon of the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA and how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA, I used the process of phenomenological reflection. Each of the three data sources was analyzed: interview transcripts, journals, and focus group transcripts. This process involved three steps:

- the wholistic or sententious approach,
- the selective or highlighting approach, and
- the detailed or line-by-line approach (van Manen, 1990, pp. 92-93).

To ensure that I incorporated all three steps into my phenomenological reflection, I utilized a data collection and analysis checklist (see Appendix J). This checklist was a working document that was modified as I went through each step of the data analysis process.

The first step in the process of phenomenological reflection was to attend to the entire text of each document. To begin, I asked myself the following question about the entire text: “What sententious phrase may capture the fundamental meaning or main significance of the text as a whole?” (van Manen, 1990, p. 93). I wrote down several meaningful phrases for each document in the form of a list. Then, I narrowed down the list by combining the phrases that had similar meanings. By doing so, I was able to establish the seven categories (or themes) of this study. These themes were then placed into a theme chart for further analysis (see Appendix K).
The second step in the process of phenomenological reflection was to re-read the same text several times in order to gain more insight into the seven emerging themes. As I re-read the text of each document, I asked myself the question: “What statement(s) or phrase(s) seem particularly essential or revealing about the phenomenon or experience being described?” (van Manen, 1990, p. 93). As I located the essential or revealing phrases in the text, I highlighted them for further review. I used a highlighter to mark the responses to each of the six research questions, color-coding by question. I also circled each essential statement or phrase with a permanent marker, color-coding by theme. These essential or revealing phrases were then added to the theme chart as examples of each theme.

The third step in the process of phenomenological reflection was to analyze each essential or revealing phrase individually. For each sentence or group of sentences that were highlighted or circled, I asked myself the following question: “What does this sentence or sentence cluster reveal about the phenomenon or experience being described?” (van Manen, 1990, p. 93). When establishing themes, the goal is to discover those aspects or qualities that make a phenomenon what it is and without which the phenomenon would cease to exist (van Manen, 1990). To do this, I used the techniques of summarization and memoing. Memoing is an analytic procedure that is often used by researchers to explain or to elaborate upon coded categories or themes (Schwandt, 2007). This was done by adding detailed, color-coded comments in the margins of each document. These detailed, color-coded comments were also sorted into a series of subthemes and placed into the theme chart.

Other techniques were also used in the data analysis for this hermeneutic phenomenological study. The interview and focus group recordings all had to be transcribed before they could be subjected to the process of phenomenological reflection. However, the
process of transcribing data is, by definition, a form of analysis. Powers (2005) recommended that every researcher should transcribe at least part of the recording for each project. As the researcher for this hermeneutic phenomenological study, I chose to transcribe all of the recordings myself in order to fully understand the participants’ perceptions of their experiences of SLA. To start, I created a verbatim transcript of each recording. The verbatim transcript included every word that was said by the participants. Then, I lightly edited each of the transcripts. Powers (2005) emphasized that research goals and skills should underlie a researcher’s decisions about how much editing is appropriate for any given transcription. The primary goal of the transcripts for this study was to present the verbal speech as clearly as possible in writing while preserving its meaning. A secondary goal of the transcripts for this study was to retain the authenticity of the verbal speech. For this reason, I chose to lightly edit some false starts, repetitions, and nonverbal sounds that affected the clarity of the speech. I also edited the transcript so that the standard spelling and grammar were used wherever possible. In addition, some insertions were made in square brackets in order to provide some context and to clarify the meaning of the speech.

I also used the technique of bracketing, or epoché, defined as “suspend[ing] judgment about the existence of the world and … [setting] aside existential assumptions made in everyday life” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 24). In other words, I made an effort to set aside my own experiences, biases, and beliefs about how SLA is achieved in order to try to understand my participants’ perceptions of their experiences of SLA.

**Trustworthiness**

To ensure the trustworthiness of this study, I used the following criteria for addressing trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. According to Guba
(1981), these four criteria address the aspects of truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality, respectively. It was also important to determine both the validity and the reliability of the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire that was used in this study.

**Credibility**

Establishing the credibility of research findings is a twofold task. It requires the researcher to complete the inquiry in such a way that the probability of producing credible findings is enhanced; it also requires the researcher to get these findings approved by the constructors of the realities themselves (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The use of data triangulation in this study enhanced the probability of producing credible findings. According to Schwandt (2007), triangulation entails the examination of a conclusion from more than one vantage point. For this study, I examined the data from three different sources, specifically interviews, journals, and focus groups. This allowed me to make a judgment about the truth value of specific data items.

I also engaged in member checking to ensure that the overall research findings were credible. Lincoln and Guba (1985) defined member checking as “the direct test of findings and interpretations with the human sources from which they have come—the constructors of the multiple realities being studied” (p. 301). Not all participants need to be included in the member checking process; however, the selected participants should be representative of as many different groups as possible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For the current study, I e-mailed all six participants two times to request that they check my work for accuracy. First, I requested that the participants check both my verbatim and my lightly edited transcriptions. According to Powers (2005), participant reviews of transcriptions allow the researcher to have an opportunity to clarify the content, to resolve ambiguities, and to obtain missing information. I highlighted the
transcriptions at the points where I had specific questions for the participants or where I was unclear about which words the participants had used. To make the transcriptions easier to review, I also sent the participants a list of questions, along with the page numbers and line numbers where the highlighted text could be found. Second, I requested that the participants check my themes for accuracy. For both my transcriptions and my themes, I asked the participants to rate my accuracy on a Likert scale from 1-5, with a 1 being “not accurate at all” and a 5 being “extremely accurate.” Not every participant responded to my request for member checking or to use the Likert scale; however, several participants did provide feedback (see Appendix L). By arranging the member checks of both my transcriptions and my themes, I gave the participants an opportunity to summarize their own experiences as well as to correct my misinterpretations of their experiences.

**Transferability**

Establishing the transferability of research findings requires the researcher to provide readers with sufficient information such that the readers of the findings can establish a degree of similarity between the case studied and the case to which the findings might be transferred (Schwandt, 2007). In order to ensure that the findings from this study could be transferred to a similar setting or group of participants, I gave a thick description of both the setting and the participants. Giving a thick description entails much more than simply giving a detailed description of the participants or the setting; it also provides the readers with a means of interpreting this information (Schwandt, 2007). For this study, I provided descriptions of the participants and their personality types in chart form as well as in narrative form so the readers could create their own interpretations and could make informed decisions about the transferability of the findings to other studies or to their own lives.
Dependability

Establishing the dependability of research findings requires the researcher to ensure that the process of inquiry is logical, traceable, and documented (Schwandt, 2007). In order to establish the dependability of this study, I left an audit trail for review by a disinterested examiner, or auditor. The auditor had experience and expertise in both psychology and research methods. An audit trail is “a systematically maintained documentation system” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 12). Throughout this study, I maintained an organized compilation of my data collection materials and procedures as well as of my data analysis materials and procedures. The auditor ensured that my process of inquiry was well-documented by utilizing an auditor’s checklist (see Appendix M).

Confirmability

Establishing the confirmability of research findings requires that the findings are grounded in the data, the inferences made based on the data are logical, and there is a fittingness of the themes to the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). First, an external auditor verified that my lightly edited interview and focus group transcriptions provided an accurate account of the audio-recorded and video-recorded data. I also left an audit trail through the use of a theme chart and through my use of memoing in order to ensure the confirmability of the data. The external auditor looked through my theme chart and through my notations to determine whether or not my interpretations of the transcribed interview and focus group data were logical. The auditor also verified my interpretations of the participants’ journal entries. The auditor utilized an auditor’s rubric (see Appendix N) in order to verify the accuracy of my transcriptions and of my interpretations.
Member checking, or soliciting the approval of the participants, also helped to safeguard against any illogical inferences. The participants were invited to give their feedback on the accuracy of my lightly edited transcriptions and on the accuracy of the seven themes that emerged from the data. The participants’ feedback was used to confirm the general accuracy of my transcriptions, as well as to make a few small revisions where needed. This feedback also helped me to confirm the accuracy of the seven themes of the study.

**Validity and Reliability of the MBTI Complete**

The MBTI Step I (Form M), which includes the MBTI Complete, is both a valid and a reliable source for identifying personality type. One way to demonstrate the validity of an MBTI instrument is to compare the reported personality type (according to the MBTI assessment) with the individuals’ own interpretation of their “best-fit” personality type (Schaubhut, Herk, & Thompson, 2009). Agreement rates between the reported personality type and the best-fit personality type was 91.1% on at least three of the four preferences, and 72.9% on all four preferences (Schaubhut et al., 2009). The reliability of the MBTI Step I (Form M) is determined by both internal consistency reliability and test-retest reliability. Cronbach’s alpha for internal consistency is .91 for the extraversion-introversion dichotomy, .92 for the sensing-intuition dichotomy, .91 for the thinking-feeling dichotomy, and .92 for the judging-perceiving dichotomy (Schaubhut et al., 2009). Test-retest reliability over a four-week interval is .95 for the extraversion-introversion dichotomy, .97 for the sensing-intuition dichotomy, .94 for the thinking-feeling dichotomy, and .95 for the judging-perceiving dichotomy (Schaubhut et al., 2009).
Ethical Considerations

Several ethical considerations needed to be taken into account when conducting this research. First, I needed to make sure that I had secured approval from both the IRB at Liberty University and from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness at CCVA before soliciting participants for the study and before collecting data from the participants. To get IRB approval, I needed to take into account the risk-to-benefit ratio of this study. I did not foresee any risks to the participants of this study that were greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine psychological examinations or tests. The benefits associated with this study included the participants’ increased self-awareness and a chance to identify their potential strengths and areas for personal growth through the use of the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire. I also needed to get a signed declaration of informed consent from each prospective participant before including them in the study. Although other students had e-mailed me to express interest or to request more information about the study, they were not considered to be prospective participants until and unless they had returned to me a signed letter of informed consent.

As with any research, there could have been ethical concerns surrounding the issues of anonymity, confidentiality, and the security of the data. To ensure the anonymity of all participants in the study, pseudonyms were given to each prospective participant as well as to the research site. I used these pseudonyms at all times during the data collection and analysis processes. The pseudonyms were also used by the participants themselves when answering the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire and when writing in the Penzu electronic journals. I also made every effort to maintain anonymity and confidentiality by emphasizing to all participants at the outset of the study as well as during the focus group itself that all identities
should be kept anonymous and that all comments made during the focus group should be kept confidential. I gained consent from all participants at the outset of the study to audio-record the interviews and to video-record the focus group, explaining to the participants that the purpose of the recording devices was to ensure the accuracy of the transcriptions. I reminded the participants of the audio or video recordings during each data collection session in case the participants preferred not to be recorded. Per IRB regulations, all records and data (including audio and video recordings, personality inventories, interview transcripts, focus group transcripts, and journals) were secured either on a password-protected computer or in a locked file cabinet. All audio and video recordings will be deleted three years from the end of the current research study. All other data will also be destroyed after a period of three years from the completion of the current study.

Summary

This chapter began with an explanation of the hermeneutic phenomenological design that was used in the current study. Next, the research question and six subquestions were presented. The setting for the study was described in detail. Thorough descriptions of the sampling procedures and the sample size for the study were also provided. The data collection procedures and the data analysis procedures that were used in this study were also explained in detail. This chapter concluded with an explanation of the considerations that were made for both trustworthiness and ethics.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

This chapter addresses the results of the data analysis for the current study. It begins with an overview of the demographics, the previous L2 experience, and the MBTI personality type of the participants. Then, each of the six participants in this study is introduced individually and is described in rich detail. The results of the data analysis are then presented in the form of themes. Each of the six subquestions is also addressed.

The purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological study was to describe the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA and to describe how these learners perceived that their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA. The study was guided by the central research question: What is the essence of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA?

The central research question was broken down into the following six subquestions:

RQ1: How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the beginning of an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ2: In what ways do these learners anticipate that their personality type will either enhance or inhibit their experience of SLA?

RQ3: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA as they progress through an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ4: How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

RQ5: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?
RQ6: In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

**Participants**

A criterion sampling procedure was employed to secure six participants for an in-depth study of their perceived experience of SLA. Male and female genders were both represented. Three different races were also represented in this study: Caucasian, African-American, and mixed (Caucasian and Asian). The participants ranged in age from 20 to 47 years. Table 2 summarizes the demographics of the six participants in this hermeneutic phenomenological study.

**Table 2**

*Participant Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley A.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl B.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle B.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn B.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Caucasian/Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah B.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline B.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>African-American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six participants also varied in terms of their previous L2 learning experiences in an FLE. Five participants had at least one previous L2 learning experience in an FLE; one
participant had no previous L2 learning experience in an FLE. Table 3 summarizes the participants’ previous L2 learning experiences in an FLE.

Table 3

Participants’ Previous L2 Learning Experiences in an FLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Type of FLE</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>Time since last experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley A.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl B.</td>
<td>K-12 College</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle B.</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn B.</td>
<td>K-12 College</td>
<td>French, Chinese</td>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah B.</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Russian, German, French*</td>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline B.</td>
<td>K-12 College</td>
<td>French, Spanish</td>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Dropped out of course after a couple weeks.

The participants also differed in terms of their personality types. Six different MBTI personality types were featured in this study. Table 4 summarizes the participants’ MBTI personality types as well as the participants’ dominant function, according to the MBTI.

Table 4

Participants’ MBTI Personality Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>MBTI type</th>
<th>Dominant function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley A.</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>Introverted Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl B.</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>Extraverted Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle B.</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>Extraverted Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>MBTI Type</td>
<td>Personality Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn B.</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>Introverted Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah B.</td>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>Introverted Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline B.</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>Extraverted Sensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ashley A.

Ashley is a 47 year old African-American female. She is a single mother and an Air Force veteran. Although she currently works in the retail industry, Ashley just recently returned to college in order to pursue a degree in technology, with a focus on networking.

Ashley’s choice to enroll in an introductory-level Spanish course was influenced by future career opportunities: “It [Picking up an L2] means I can learn another language, which I think is an asset. In the working world, it can open up more doors, where people are looking for someone who is bilingual.” Prior to enrolling in the introductory-level Spanish course at CCVA, Ashley had never before taken an L2 in an FLE.

Ashley’s reported MBTI personality type is ISTP, which indicates that her dominant function is introverted thinking. She stated that the results were “spot on,” revealing that she believes that ISTP is also her best-fit personality type. Although she has confidence in all four MBTI type preferences, Ashley believes her preference for thinking is the most descriptive of her personality. Ashley describes herself as being both observant and analytical. She explained, “My brain is always going … I like to figure out things that—. Why things do what they do, especially if they don’t work. And then I like to try to figure out how to fix it.” She further recounted, “I remember when I was young, with food, I would always—if I didn’t know exactly what it was—I would always smell it … I wouldn’t put it in my mouth unless I could smell it first.” Ashley describes herself as being quiet and reserved, but friendly. She added, “People
think that I have—that I look unapproachable if they just see me standing or sitting afar, but I’m actually very approachable. Just cautious.” Ashley also describes herself as being adaptable and not resistant to change.

Table 5 summarizes Ashley’s perception of the ISTP type description as it relates to her own personality. Although she agrees with many of the descriptors and characteristics for the ISTP personality type, there are some descriptors that she believes do not fit her personality.

Regarding the descriptor, detached, Ashley explained,

When I think detached, I think of someone who’s, like, a loner, someone who’s always by themselves, always, you know, just never around other people, and just seem like they’re in their own space. And I don’t feel that I’m that way.

Table 5

*Ashley A.’s Perception of her MBTI Type Description*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taker</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carl B.

Carl is a 22 year old Caucasian male. He is full-time liberal arts major at CCVA. In addition to working part-time at a movie theater, Carl enjoys volunteering his time and his energy at his church and at a local wrestling company. Although he is unsure of his exact career path, Carl knows that he wants to have a career in which he will be able to utilize his talents. He explained, “Whatever I do, I want it to be where I can interact with people, and I can just have fun and be creative.”

Carl enrolled in an introductory-level Spanish course at CCVA in order to fulfill the requirements of an associate’s degree. Although he had previously taken Spanish courses in both high school and in college, none of the credits had transferred over. Carl admitted that he probably would not be taking the course if it weren’t a requirement for his degree. He explained, “I mean, I really have no desire to leave the country … So, I feel like I’m going to keep my butt planted on American soil.”
Carl’s reported MBTI personality type is ENFP, which indicates that his dominant function is extraverted intuition. He confirmed that ENFP is also his best-fit personality type: “I actually thought this thing [the MBTI type description] described me perfectly.” Carl was less confident about all the individual type preferences; however, he felt very strongly that the extraversion and feeling type preferences described him well. He describes himself as being sociable, affable, and caring, adding, “I feel like I’m a people person.” He acknowledged how important his personal values are for him when making decisions. Carl also describes himself as being a very enthusiastic and energetic person. He explained,

I am chock-full of energy. And sometimes, I got so much energy, I don’t know what to do with [it]. I mean, my mom can tell you, I’ve been pacing like a caged bear since I could walk. [laughs] In fact, I actually—this actually happened to me last night …

Moreover, Carl describes himself as being imaginative, creative, and distractible. He related,

I always have, like, a little theater plan in my head. And I’m always playing out scenes … it’s like I just lock myself up in my room, and just go—just imagine this whole scenario happening, and it just—this whole scene happening around me, in which I’m a character, and just—playing through that over and over again … in fact, a couple stories that I have written have come out of doing that.

Table 6 summarizes Carl’s perception of the ENFP type description as it relates to his own personality. He believes all the descriptors describe him to some extent; however, he notes that some are more much more evident of him than the others. Regarding the descriptor, cooperative, Carl mused,
I guess if you define cooperative as like, being a team player, I’d like to think I’m a team player, but historically, I have had trouble in group situations … I’m either the one who does nothing or the one who does everything.

Table 6

*Carl B.’s Perception of his MBTI Type Description*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregarious</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insightful</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lively</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personable</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love variety—of ideas, people, and environments</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring a lot of energy and enthusiasm to whatever they turn their attention to</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated by new people, ideas, and experiences</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See connections or relationships between ideas or events</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make their decisions based on personal values</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Danielle B.

Danielle is a 20 year old Caucasian female. She has been taking classes at CCVA for three semesters, but is planning to transfer to either a nursing school or to a university. She currently works in retail and at a day care. Her future career plan is to be a nurse, working in either neonatal, pediatrics, or labor and delivery.

Danielle has previously taken Spanish in both middle and high school, and she admits that she did not do very well. She explained, “In high school, I just did it because I just wanted to get a good, advanced diploma, and graduate and get the heck out of there. And I didn’t care less about Spanish.” However, Danielle has multiple reasons for enrolling in an introductory-level Spanish course at CCVA. She has plans to travel to Puerto Rico with her best friend, whose L1 is Spanish. Danielle also acknowledged, “I got into college, and it’s also a big, important part of, like, my degree, to have that. So I figured, hey, I’d take that. And plus, I’d understand my best friend, and her family.”

Danielle’s reported MBTI type is ESFJ, which indicates that her dominant function is extraverted feeling. She had previously taken the MBTI for one of her college classes, and she received the same results. Of the four type preferences that make up her MBTI personality type, Danielle believes that either feeling or extraversion describe her best. She discussed the importance of following her own gut feelings, even if they differ from those of her family. She also explained her preference for extraversion: “Because [of] the way people are around me. Like, if somebody has an attitude or whatever, you know, I’m not going to be that happy either.”
Overall, Danielle describes herself as being friendly, sociable, outgoing and bubbly. She also describes herself as an energetic person, declaring, “I’m just always super-hyped.”

Table 7 summarizes Danielle’s perception of the ESFJ type description as it relates to her own personality. Although she feels that several of the descriptors match her personality, she is less certain about some of the others. Regarding the descriptor, decisive, Danielle laughed, stating: “I don’t always make—I can’t always make decisions. I’m like, indecisive.” Regarding the descriptor, consistent, Danielle referenced her homework, which she doesn’t complete every night.

Table 7

*Danielle B.’s Perception of her MBTI Type Description*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down-to-earth</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderly</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personable</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorough</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided by their personal values</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Base their decisions on experience and facts  Disagree

Value security and stability  Neutral

Committed to preserving and celebrating traditions  Agree

Mainly interested in the realities they perceive with their five senses  Neutral

Note. Descriptors and characteristics of the ESFJ type description adapted from the participant’s individualized MBTI profile and type description. Copyright 2007 by P. B. Myers and K. D. Myers.

Evelyn B.

Evelyn is a 33 year old female. She is of mixed race (Caucasian and Asian). She already holds a bachelor’s degree, but chose to return to school in order to change her career. Evelyn plans to go into nursing. She currently works part-time at the hospital as a care technician. She also works part-time as a tutor in the Academic Support Center at CCVA.

Evelyn has had previous experience taking an L2 in an FLE. She took French throughout middle school and high school. For her bachelor’s degree, she took both French and Chinese. She decided to enroll in an introductory-level Spanish course at CCVA because she believes it is important for her future job. She explained, “I felt that being able to communicate with Spanish-speaking patients is important, and improves the level of care that they receive.”

Evelyn’s reported MBTI type is ISFP, which indicates that her dominant function is introverted feeling. Evelyn believes her MBTI results are “surprisingly accurate,” given that she also feels that “Personality is sort of multi-faceted, and it’s hard to pinpoint.” Although she does not feel strongly about most of the type preferences, Evelyn is very clear about her preference for introversion. She revealed, “Being around large groups of people is exhausting for me. And I do tend to be sort of inward-looking.” Evelyn describes herself as being reserved, quiet, and private. She explained, “I don’t have Facebook. I don’t like people to know anything about me that I
don’t say to them. And I do love to be alone and quiet and read.” She continued, “You know, cooking, reading, just—feeling good. Eating. These are all things that really get me excited. You know, sleeping when you’re tired.” Evelyn also describes herself as practical and sensitive. “I’m very—sort of attuned to the tone and sort of subtext of situations. Nonverbal language. So, sensitive in that way. So, sensitive to others and I’m also sensitive myself.”

Table 8 summarizes Evelyn’s perception of the ISFP type description as it relates to her own personality. She believes that all the descriptors describe her to some extent; however, there are some that are less characteristic of her than others. She explains,

I wouldn’t say I’m particularly warm. Or tender. [pause] I don’t think I have a warm personality. I come off as cold to others, because I am quiet and sort of reserved. So I think that can be sort of taken as cold, and maybe stuck up.

As for the descriptor, spontaneous, it depends on how Evelyn interprets the word. Although she does not enjoy thrills, Evelyn feels she has an easy-going personality, and can easily adapt to different situations.

Table 8

_Evelyn B.’s Perception of her MBTI Type Description_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to take time to enjoy the people and the world around them</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are attuned to the sensory details in their environment</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find quiet satisfaction in simple pleasures</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn more by doing than by reading</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easygoing nature often hides their deep values and commitments</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Descriptors and characteristics of the ISFP type description adapted from the participant’s individualized MBTI profile and type description. Copyright 2007 by P. B. Myers and K. D. Myers.

**Hannah B.**

Hannah is a 39 year old Caucasian female, who is married with no kids. She has been a paramedic for 14 years, but is back in school in order to change her career. Although she is currently in the nursing program at CCVA, Hannah plans to transfer to a university in order to obtain degrees in exercise physiology and physical therapy.

Hannah has some experience taking an L2 in an FLE. She took Russian, German, and French in high school. However, she dropped French after only a couple of weeks, citing “We [French and I] didn’t get along … I don’t know what it was about French, but it didn’t click.” Hannah chose to enroll in an introductory-level Spanish course at CCVA because she needs a college-level language course for her bachelor’s degree.
Hannah’s reported MBTI type is INFP, which indicates that her dominant function is introverted feeling. She is uncertain about some of the reported type preferences, stating that “It’s hard to describe personality.” However, Hannah is clear about her preference for introversion. She explained, “I tend to work better by myself, rather than in groups.” She is the least certain about her preference for feeling, although she describes the importance of personal values and beliefs. She admits, “I tend to go on, I guess, what I think and feel, and not necessarily what other people would think and feel in the same situation.” Besides describing herself as quiet, reserved, and introspective, Hannah also believes she is an open-minded, accepting, and tolerant person. She also describes herself as adaptable, adding, “As a paramedic, I feel like you kind of have to be adaptable, so I’ve kind of learned to adapt to whichever situation and group of people that I’m around.”

Table 9 summarizes Hannah’s perception of the INFP type description as it relates to her own personality. Although she agrees with many of the descriptors, there are a few that she believes do not characterize her. She disagrees with the descriptor, idealistic, because she feels it has a very narrow definition. She disagrees with the descriptor, complex, because she believes that she has an easy-going personality and that she is an easy person with whom to get along. Regarding the descriptor, visionary, she revealed: “When I think of visionary, I think of somebody that’s ready to, like, solve all the world’s problems, and I would like to solve my latest craft problem, and not necessarily the whole world’s problems.”

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Hannah B.'s Perception of her MBTI Type Description_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealistic</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspective</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealistic and may be perfectionists</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an inner core of values that guides all their interactions and decisions</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are loyal to their values and want to live their life in a way that is congruent with those values</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are often good at expressing themselves in writing</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Descriptors and characteristics of the INFP type description adapted from the participant’s individualized MBTI profile and type description. Copyright 2007 by P. B. Myers and K. D. Myers.*

**Jacqueline B.**

Jacqueline is a 43 year old, unmarried, African-American female, as well as a mother of one. She holds a bachelor’s degree in Psychology, but she is going back to school to earn her master’s degree in either social work or nursing. She has worked as a mental health community-based counselor for the past seven years.
Jacqueline has some experience taking an L2 in an FLE. She took Spanish in college, albeit approximately 20 years ago. Jacqueline also took French in high school, and she admits that she does not remember any of it. There are several reasons for Jacqueline’s choice to enroll in an introductory-level Spanish course at CCVA. She stated, “I really want to be proficient in it, [so] that I’m able to understand everything, that I could get a job, and that I wouldn’t have any issues with being able to communicate with someone who speaks Spanish.” She believes that communicating with those who speak other languages is important, especially for those in the helping professions like nursing and social work. As for why she chose to take Spanish, she explained, “Hispanics are the number one minorities in the United States. And so, definitely, there’s a need to be able to speak that second language.”

Jacqueline’s reported MBTI type is ESFP, which indicates that her dominant function is extraverted sensing. She confirms that ESFP is also her best-fit type. She stated, “Basically, this MBTI does sum me up. [laughs] So definitely, what was identified during that testing definitely describes me.” Although she believes the ESFP type accurately describes her, Jacqueline is less certain about the individual type preferences. She is confident, however, about her preference for extraversion. She explained,

I find people fascinating. I really do. People are really interesting. I can just look out the window and just see something attractive about a person that makes them interesting … I just like being around people and having fun.

Jacqueline describes herself not only as being sociable, outgoing, and friendly, but also as being positive and optimistic. She explained, “My thing is, in every ordeal, there’s something positive you can gain from it.” Jacqueline also characterizes herself as being flexible and easy-going. She asserted,
Sometimes, in life, you have to have that flexibility. You know, everything is not from A to B, from B to C. You got to be flexible in life. So, I mean, you just got to go with the flow and just make it work.

Table 10 summarizes Jacqueline’s perception of the ESFP type description as it relates to her personality. She believes all the descriptors describe her. However, she was uncertain about some of the characteristics. Regarding the characteristic, “[ESFPs] make decisions based on their values,” Jacqueline asserted,

Sometimes, you got to throw those values out the window … Certain things I don’t believe in, but, just because I don’t like it, or I don’t believe in it, or it’s my value that you shouldn’t be doing that, I can’t let that determine how I’m going to treat you or if I’m going to help you.

Table 10

Jacqueline B.’s Perception of her MBTI Type Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congenial</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easygoing</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exuberant</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun loving</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregarious</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observant</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playful</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourceful</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportive Agree
Sympathetic Agree
Tactful Agree
Warm Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are exuberant lovers of life, people, and material comforts</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy working with others to make things happen</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are flexible and spontaneous and adapt readily to new people and environments</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are very attuned to their immediate sensory experience</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make decisions based on their values</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Descriptors and characteristics of the ESFP type description adapted from the participant’s individualized MBTI profile and type description. Copyright 2007 by P. B. Myers and K. D. Myers.

Results

Seven themes emerged from the data to describe the essence of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA. The essence of SLA describes the perceived experiences of SLA that were shared among these learners. It also describes the learners’ perceptions of how their personality types either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA. For the last two themes, I have chosen to add clarifying information in parentheses in order to differentiate between the two themes without changing how the experience of SLA was perceived by these learners.

The adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA perceived that:

- SLA is the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in a variety of formats in the L2.
- SLA refers to a range of function in the L2.
- They were apprehensive about their experience of SLA.
- Using the L2 outside of the FLE enhanced their experience of SLA.
• It was difficult to explain the connection between their MBTI personality types and their experience of SLA.

• Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with their dominant functions) enhanced their experience of SLA.

• Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with the extraversion and perceiving attitudes) enhanced their experience of SLA.

**SLA as the Ability to Comprehend and to Produce Comprehensibly in the L2**

In the broadest of terms, the adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA described SLA as the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in the L2. Moreover, they described a variety of formats for comprehending and producing the L2: verbalized language, written language, and culturally-influenced body language (e.g., gestures).

All six participants viewed the production and the comprehension of verbalized language as important components of SLA. When asked what someone who has acquired an L2 would be able to do, Ashley explained, “They would be able to speak it. They should be able to understand it. Yeah. They should be able to speak and understand. Like if you picked it up, those are your results.” Danielle agreed: “To pick it [an L2] up, I feel like it’s more verbal, and understanding it verbally, [in] that way.”

Some participants emphasized the importance of comprehending verbalized language. Evelyn explained, “That’s sort of the beginning of picking up a language … Is understanding what the teacher is saying and what’s going on around you. That’s part of picking it up.” Ashley observed, “They [people who have acquired an L2] understand certain words, or sentences that people say. They kind of have an ear for [it].” Hannah also focused on the comprehension aspect of SLA. She explained,
I guess it [SLA] would just be how easily you pick up the language. How easily you can, kind of, think that way, I guess. How quickly it makes sense … I guess they [people who have acquired an L2] would be comfortable with it. They would be able to pick up words pretty quickly in conversation, and that sort of thing.

Other participants emphasized the importance of producing verbalized language. When asked what determines whether or not someone has acquired an L2, Jacqueline affirmed, “Definitely if they’re able to speak it. If they’re able to communicate and to speak the language.” Being able to produce the language comprehensibly was also important to the participants. Carl explained,

If you can communicate and be understood by those that speak the language, then that’s a good sign that you’ve picked it up. And that they’re not rolling on the floor laughing, because you said something you didn’t mean to.

He later rationalized, “I mean, the point of picking up a language is so you can communicate with speakers of that language. So, obviously, to communicate—in order to communicate, you have to be understood.”

Many of the participants believed that SLA is more than just the ability to comprehend and produce the L2 in a verbal format. Carl stated, “Speaking, understanding, and writing. I think they are all pretty essential in terms of picking up a language.” Evelyn agreed that SLA did not refer to just verbal language:

Language acquisition and picking up a second language means being able to read, write, and speak in that language … so, even if you don’t know how to speak it, if you can read it—that’s also, you’ve picked it up. From a reading perspective.
Jacqueline also supported the idea that SLA is more than just producing and comprehending the L2 verbally. She stated, “It kind of still goes back to understanding the culture, the symbols, [the] gestures. I think that also goes with picking up a language … it’s not all about articulating your words.”

The participants perceived that the formats through which people acquire an L2 are based on their intentions for acquiring the L2 as well as on their individualized L2 learning goals. Some L2 learners experience SLA through multiple formats; others only produce and comprehend the L2 through a single format. Evelyn explained,

You can have picked it up and have just never bothered to learn how to write. I mean, or read, for that matter. You could just be a completely verbal communicator … [or] hypothetically, you could have a completely—. You’d be pen-pals with someone, I guess, and you wouldn’t actually speak it. You can write it. Yeah. So, I guess you could pick up the writing only. But it seems a lot—. Like, it makes a lot more sense to do all of it together, if you’re going to learn a language.

Carl added:

I know a lot of people who can communicate—with speaking English—who can communicate English well, in terms—well, when speaking verbally. But when it comes to writing, they can’t get a sentence out without LOL, ampersand, smiley face.

Evelyn agreed:

Yeah, like kids, for that matter. You know, like a four-year-old can pick up English, but you don’t expect a four-year-old to write. Right? You just speak enough or pick it up enough to learn how to play. We all have different intents when we’re learning a language.
Speaking about her own L2 learning goals, Danielle commented:

Yeah, because I probably won’t write Spanish as much as I’ll speak it. So I feel like, maybe, you don’t really have to know how to write it, as long as you can say the words, I guess. Or pronounce it in some sort of way.

Jacqueline also thought it was important to consider individual L2 learning goals. For some people, she reasoned, there is a need to acquire gestures and other non-verbalized forms of the L2 instead of the verbalized form. She explained:

What do you do when people are not able to speak? So, it’s very important for you to learn the language, grant that, but to be able to articulate it [verbally] with words, not so much. Because, you know, there’s people that may have—may not be able to talk. Maybe they’re deaf or whatever. So, picking up the language also means to me, knowing about the culture as well … being able to understand the, I guess, the mannerisms, characteristics. I think all of that plays a part as well.

**SLA as a Range of Function in the L2**

The participants believed that people vary with respect to their ability to function in the L2. Not only do people acquire their L2 through various formats, but they also acquire their L2 to different extents. Evelyn described SLA in the following way:

Language acquisition, I think, is a range. There’s no, like, one point where it says, “Oh, you’ve acquired the language.” I think you can acquire a language to a small extent, or you can acquire it to a great extent.

The participants believed that acquiring an L2 to a great extent takes time, and usually requires people to take more than a single introductory-level Spanish course. Danielle explained,
I feel like, you can’t just pick up the language, like, “Oh! Here. Take this one class and you got the language.” It’s more like, it’s going to take a few years for you to pick up this language, and you’re going to have to use this language outside of school—.

Jacqueline agreed:

You can take a course, but that doesn’t necessarily mean that you picked up the skill set to speak the language. And the reason why I say that, because although this was an introductory-level Spanish course, I noticed that some of the students there still struggled with speaking it. They may [have] understood it on paper, but as far as being verbally able to speak it, they were having a little bit of difficulty.

Ashley also addressed the issue of SLA after one introductory-level Spanish course:

I wouldn’t say [people would speak] fluently, after just one course. I would just say—[there are] some things that they would be able to talk about. Just, easy things, like, “Hi, How are you?,” and “What is your name?,” “How old are you?,” “Where are you from?” Simple things like that.

The participants perceived that people who take the time to acquire their L2 to a great extent would have a range of functions related to their ability to produce and comprehend the L2. They believed that people who have acquired their L2 to a great extent would be able to communicate with the L1 speakers of the language. Carl suggested, “I think the most obvious test for whether or not you’ve acquired the language is being able to communicate with the native speakers of the language.” Ashley recalled:

There’s some people who I’ve talked to that—they understand it, but they can’t necessarily speak it. So, I’d say you’d have to be at least—to be able to communicate
with someone, you’d need to be at least—your fluency needs to be at least, I’d say 60 to 70 percent.

Regarding her own goals for acquiring the L2, Jacqueline explained, “I think that taking an introductory Spanish class, it will give me the basics, so that way, I’m able to communicate with individuals that I need—that I will eventually work with, that are Spanish [speakers].”

Many of the participants also believed that people who have acquired their L2 to a great extent would be able to travel or find employment. When asked what someone who has acquired an L2 would be able to do, Evelyn suggested,

They would be able to get around in a country where that is the main language spoken. So, they’d be able to use public transport—. You know, take care of paying their bills, banking, customer service, and maybe work. Possibly.

Hannah mentioned, “[They would] hopefully get around at least at a tourist level and, you know, be able to find their way through town and get the necessities. Food, lodging, shelter, bathroom.”

Carl joked, “[You would communicate] well enough so that you’re not that bloody tourist, trying to ask directions from a police officer while holding a big, bulky dictionary in your hand.”

Regarding her own abilities in the L2, Danielle simply stated, “I’m hoping that I’ll be able to have conversations and travel. Meet new people.”

Some of the participants also believed that people who acquired their L2 to a great extent would also be able to think in their L2. Evelyn stated, “If they think in that language, they’ve done a very good job of picking it up.” Carl agreed:

When I’m trying to talk in Spanish, I’m always saying—thinking about—. The English is always in my head. How it’s translating to English. So, I guess if you’ve—if you’ve
truly picked up—if you’ve truly become fluent in that language, you’re not having to—.

You’re not thinking about the conversion process in your head.

**Apprehension about their Experience of SLA**

The participants were apprehensive about their experience of SLA, or their ability to produce and comprehend their L2. They described their apprehension in two specific areas: verbal production of their L2 and verbal comprehension of their L2. These feelings of apprehension continued (and sometimes worsened) as the participants progressed through their introductory-level Spanish course.

Many of the participants described their apprehension about their experience of SLA as it related to the verbal production of their L2. When asked how well she thought she had picked up the L2 during the course, Ashley responded, “So-so. I don’t think—. Like I said, I can have maybe small conversations, and I can—I do understand more than I can speak. I’ll say that.” Danielle was also apprehensive about her ability to verbally produce her L2. She explained, “When I was speaking with my [Spanish-speaking] best friend, I would spell the word because I didn’t know how to say it. I would just spell it out, because I’m better at memorizing it that way than verbally.” Jaqueline wrote in her journal about her difficulty verbally producing her L2: “I still have trouble articulating my words and sentences.” Of all the participants, however, Evelyn was the most outspoken about her apprehension toward the verbal production of her L2. In one of her journal entries, Evelyn explained:

I feel like we never really practice speaking the language to one another, so while my reading is good, I don’t know if I would say I’m “picking it [the L2] up.” … without practice I am still slow and do better comprehending rather than producing the language.
In another journal entry, Evelyn reiterated her feelings of apprehension about the verbal production of her L2:

I am least confident about my speaking ability. I think this class material is a great foundation for learning Spanish, but I don’t know that I’m really picking up the language because when it comes to producing the language I don’t feel too fluent speaking.

Evelyn also discussed her verbal production abilities during her focus group session. She commented,

I don’t know about you, Carl, but I thought my reading comprehension and my ability to do the little homework and exercises written was much better than producing [verbally]. … [If] you said, “[Evelyn], how do you say”—I don’t know—“I’m going to go play racquetball this afternoon,” I wouldn’t be able to produce it quite as fast. … I didn’t take as many opportunities to speak in class as I might have. And I feel like if I had practiced a little more speaking, I would be a little more comfortable. You know, my speaking would be a little less choppy and full of pauses.

Many of the participants also described their apprehension about their experience of SLA as it related to the verbal comprehension of their L2. Specifically, these participants found it difficult to understand L1 speakers of the language due to the fast rate of their speech. At the beginning of the course, Ashley stated:

Hopefully, by the end of the semester, I’m hoping to be able to have—to understand, at least when I hear the language. Most of it. I mean, some people speak it very fast, so I may have to say, “Slow down.” But, I’m hoping to at least be able to understand a lot … at least understand more.
At the end of the semester, she acknowledged that she was still having trouble understanding L1 speakers of the language. She explained,

At work … Maybe a customer, or even the people that—like, the cleaning people, the—a lot of them are Spanish—Hispanic. And, when I hear them talk, it’s like—they talk so fast that it’s like, I may catch one word or so… That’s when I’m like, “Okay. Yeah I got work to do.” [laughs]

Carl was also very apprehensive about his ability to comprehend his L2. In one of his journal entries, he wrote, “Speaking and understanding are two different things; while I feel certain I could use a reasonable level of dialect in a Spanish-speaking situation, I fear that I would not be able to comprehend native speakers.” He later joked,

Of course, the native speakers, they know the language. They can speak it rapidly, and like, one goes, [intentionally unclear sound]. I cannot keep up. I mean, I can get—. A few words stand out, but everything else is a blur. Kind of like rap music. [laughs]

Carl was also apprehensive about the idea of listening to the L2 inside the FLE. He explained, I wouldn’t want a teacher who talks more Spanish than English. I’d have a problem. I need that safety net to fall back on. Because I don’t want to be in the position where the professor says, “[Carl!] What did I just ask you to do?” [I’d] be like, “Uh—?”

In his final interview as well as during the focus group, Carl also revealed his mindset about some of the in-class listening activities:

When we had those assignments where we had to watch this 10-minute video of one of those dramas—just, people talking back and forth—I really didn’t connect with that … and I really couldn’t retain it. … I guess that shows I’m not really that far along, because I couldn’t really understand—keep up with all the conversation going on.
Even though Danielle was often around L1 Spanish speakers, she acknowledged that it was still difficult for her to understand her L2 at times. She recounted, “When I went to church with them [my best friend’s family]. And, the preacher was preaching. I didn’t understand a thing he said. [laughs] He was talking so fast.”

At the end of the course, Jacqueline recapped her experience acquiring her L2, focusing on the aspect of comprehending verbal language:

I’m one step closer to being able to communicate with others that speak a second language. … However, I’m still sort of limited in understanding what they’re saying, because they go so fast. … [but] if someone talks slowly, I understand.

Sometimes, the participants’ feelings of apprehension toward their experience of SLA were related to the course itself. Some of the participants attributed their feelings of apprehension to the course content—namely, the vocabulary and the grammar concepts. During her first interview, Ashley laughed,

Spanish is frustrating. So—. I hate ser and I hate estar already. But, I’m going to get this thing. … But I did have to get a tutor. Because, like I said, those things I mentioned are—have just been—ugh.

A few weeks later, her level of apprehension was even higher. In her first journal entry, Ashley wrote,

For the past couple of weeks I have been very stressed with my Spanish class. I’ve felt that I was not fully understanding and retaining the vocabulary and grammar. I have struggled with the quizzes getting grades like 76% and 78% … I had a test on Thursday that I had been soooo nervous and feeling anxiety about taking the test. My anxiety was so great that I contemplated withdrawing from the class.
When she was asked about her experience of SLA at the end of her introductory-level Spanish course, Ashley commented:

Very frustrating. Very, very frustrating. With the stem-changing words, the preterite tense. Those things are still confusing to me to remember. So, it was a good experience, because I wanted to learn it, but it was very frustrating. I had to have a tutor the whole time.

Although Carl had taken several Spanish courses before, he was also apprehensive about his experience of SLA. A few weeks into the course, he stated:

Even after all the Spanish courses I’ve taken, I would not feel comfortable just upping and taking a trip to Spain, because I feel like, if I got thrown into the fire, I’d be completely lost. … I have a feeling if I found myself shipwrecked on an island where the people only spoke Spanish, I have a feeling I’d probably find out that I know more than I think I do. But my confidence on the language right now is just zip. Ish. [laughs]

Carl’s apprehension continued as he progressed through the course. In his first journal entry, Carl wrote, “I find myself feeling more confident with some of the grammar than I was before … and part of me is afraid my success in this class will lull me into a false sense of confidence.” A month later, he wrote,

My confidence has been somewhat diminished from the previous entry. We’ve started going into the irregular verb conjugations and trying to retain those in my head has become a bit of a challenge. I have found them to be a little confusing.

At the end of the course, Carl once more described his lack of confidence with some of the grammar concepts:
When we got into the irregulars, and the stem-changing [verbs], that was when my confidence was kind of shaken. Because it was a matter of all these—. In the back of my mind, I’m thinking, “All these other words follow that pattern.” It’s like, these are the—. I almost saw these irregular words as almost the anarchist, the ones that have to go against everything else, and therefore, makes it harder on me, because I have to remember these specific words. These things are not like the others. You know what I mean?

Danielle was also apprehensive when it came to understanding the grammar concepts. In her journal entries, she wrote, “As time has passed the class has gotten a bit more difficult,” and “It is getting more difficult to understand all the endings of the words and conjugate.” When asked to describe her experience of SLA at the end of her introductory-level Spanish course, Danielle explained, “Well, more towards the end, we had like, all these new verbs and words to put together, and where to put everything, and that was when it got really confusing and frustrating. ‘Cause it was so much to memorize.”

Evelyn was more confident in her knowledge of grammar toward the beginning of the course; however, she admitted that as the class went on, she became more confused with some of the concepts. In her third journal entry, Evelyn wrote, “Getting into the past …. past perfect? I’m not sure what you call it … yo hable, tu hablaste, el hablo … ellos hablaron … is getting more difficult.” At the end of her introductory-level Spanish course, Evelyn explained more:

With the most recent thing that we studied, which was the—I want to say basic past tense. Preterite? Is that right? … So, that’s something that I was less familiar with. It didn’t just automatically make sense. I had to look at it a bit more, so I guess there was some confusion. Oh! And then when—indirect object pronouns? Or direct object
pronouns? … That just didn’t make a whole lot of sense to me, because I couldn’t equate it with something we did in English. … I don’t feel like I could just—[snaps finger]—produce the language off the top of my head. So I guess, in that sense, I haven’t picked up the past tense or direct object pronouns. Or indirect object pronouns.

Jacqueline also became more apprehensive about her experience of SLA as she progressed through her introductory-level Spanish course. At the beginning of the course, she was more confident:

It was a little scary at first, because it’s been a while since I’ve taken a foreign language class, but you know, it comes with the territory, so I just see it as something that’s necessary. So, I don’t really have any jitters or anything.

About halfway through the course, however, Jacqueline wrote, “I am still having difficulty congregating [sic] the words especially with the stem changes. Although as we move further along and the Spanish is getting more difficult, I am still up for the challenge.” At the end of her introductory-level Spanish course, Jacqueline explained further:

The only time I felt that I wasn’t doing well was when it came to conjugating those verbs. Sometimes, I got a little confused with that. And that was the only frustrating time, like, “Man, I’m not getting this. Come on [Jacqueline], you’re not getting this.” But the more I practiced, the better I got, so … As we moved along, of course it got a little harder and harder. So, you know, that kind of contributed to the uneasiness.

Jacqueline also admitted:

So, I would kind of get mad at myself because I wasn’t quite understanding. Like, you know, why we’re doing this, all of a sudden, now we got to do this. … So that aspect, I
think. Just the—. Just being able to—not being able to just comprehend. And just, you
know. Especially if you’re an overachiever. And you’re not doing as well as you like.

Some of the participants also attributed their apprehension about their experience of SLA
to either the pacing or the format of the course. Danielle and Jacqueline both felt apprehensive
due to the pacing of the course. Danielle reflected,

We were going so fast, trying to get it all done in that semester. And it’s just, the pace
changed, so I feel like that changed my learning as well, because I guess I’m [at] more of
a slow, kind of pace, so—.

Jacqueline agreed:

You know, it’s a lot of information to retain. So, you know, you get frustrated. You’re
only in the class for two hours—I mean, two days a week for like, two hours. And so,
you know, that can be frustrating, along with work and everything else.

Ashley and Hannah both felt apprehensive when it came to the online component of the course.
In one of her journal entries, Ashley wrote, “The online piece to this class, VHL Central, I don’t
feel I am learning very well.” Hannah also seemed to struggle with the online portion of her
course. She explained,

This is stressing me out a great deal. … I’m used to—. The times that I’ve taken
languages before, it was an everyday thing. You know. You went in, you had a set
lesson plan, and that was it. Now, it’s pretty much, you go in, you’ve got a few minutes
of class, and most of all your stuff is online, so—. There’s more of a burden for you to
teach yourself, I guess, than to be taught.

Using the L2 Outside of the FLE Enhances SLA
Many of the participants assumed the responsibility of either listening to or conversing with L1 Spanish speakers outside of the FLE. They perceived that using their L2 outside of the FLE enhanced their experience of SLA.

Although Carl believed that using his L2 outside of the FLE could improve his experience of SLA, he acknowledged that he had not always taken advantage of the opportunities to practice using his L2. At the beginning of his introductory-level Spanish course, Carl admitted, “I don’t devote a lot of time to it [Spanish] outside of class. So I think by the time I get back to a new class, I’m sort of a little—a little back.” As he progressed through his introductory-level Spanish course, however, Carl’s desire to use his L2 more outside of the FLE increased. In one of his journal entries, Carl expressed, “I have yet to find myself in a position where I’d have to attempt a conversation with a native speaker.” Although he did not produce his L2 outside of the FLE, however, Carl did take the opportunity to practice his L2 listening comprehension abilities. He confessed,

I’ve tuned into the Spanish [television] station a couple of times. So, I’ve even tried—. [laughs] I’ve even tried—[I] don’t know if I should be saying this, but I’ve even tried eavesdropping a bit while sitting at a Mexican restaurant.

Carl was not the only participant to use the technique of eavesdropping in order to develop the ability to comprehend his L2. At the beginning of her introductory level Spanish course, Ashley explained,

When I’m around some people who are speaking Spanish, I—. Just little things. It’s not much yet, but just a couple of words, I may, just kind of [think] like, “Ooh! I know what that word means.” [laughs] So, I think that’s how I know I’m starting to pick it up.

At the end of her introductory-level Spanish course, Ashley recounted,
I was in a store one day, and a little girl was talking to her mom, in Spanish. And she was talking about a gift. And I knew that. But, I asked the lady—well, I just said, “I’m studying Spanish. Did she just ask about a gift?” And she says, “Yeah! She did.”

[laughs] It made me feel really good.

Ashley also described how this listening technique had enhanced her experience of SLA. She explained, “I think I pay attention more. Yeah, I pay attention more. And I try harder to understand what I’m hearing. Or reading.”

Danielle also related a story in which she listened to (and understood) a conversation between two L1 Spanish speakers:

Like, at my old job, these guys were Spanish, and they were talking about me. They were like, “Oh, that girl’s so beautiful.” And I knew exactly what they said. And I was like, “I know what you’re saying!” [laughs]

In her journal, Danielle described another situation in which she was able to listen to and comprehend her L2 outside of the FLE. She wrote, “I recently attended a Latina wedding it was all in Spanish but I knew a lot of what they were saying… I have seen how it has been helpful in my life learning Spanish.” Later, Danielle explained more about how she believed her experience of SLA had been enhanced by using her L2 outside of the FLE. She stated,

I feel like I’ve learned a lot more. I can pick out bits and pieces of what—. Like, as I said, my friend is Spanish, and like, I can pick up stuff that they’re saying sometimes. And, try to piece it together. I mean, I can’t always get it together, but I feel like it’s helped me understand some things better.

Jacqueline also discussed the importance of listening to L1 Spanish speakers. In her journal, she wrote:
I even find myself if I am in the company of native speaking Spanish people, I still to [sic] listen closely to what they are saying in hopes that I am able to understand and eventually be able to hold a full conversation.

Jacqueline also explained how her experience of SLA had been enhanced by using her L2 outside of the FLE. She detailed,

I’m more in tune to what people are saying now. I do try to approach others that are Spanish, and I listen carefully. Even though I’m not where I want to be, but I do understand some of the language.

Although most of the participants perceived it to be important to practice their L2 listening comprehension outside of the FLE, many of them also thought it was desirable to practice producing their L2 outside of the FLE. As they progressed through their introductory-level Spanish course, many of the participants sought opportunities in their daily lives to converse with L1 Spanish speakers.

Many of the participants found opportunities to produce their L2 in the workplace. Evelyn perceived that by using her L2 at work, she was able to reinforce what she learned in class. She explained,

At work, I was able to tell someone the hospital room of their friend in Spanish. I was able to ask very basic questions to patients. So, that was good. I felt like I was really using what I learned in class. So, I guess I picked it up in a sense that I could take what I learned in class and use it in real life.

Danielle also had a chance to speak with L1 Spanish speakers at work. Like Evelyn, she perceived that it was useful to reinforce the verbal language skills that were taught in the FLE. In one of her journal entries, she reported,
I recently had another encounter with Spanish being helpful in my everyday life. I was at my job at a register checking two gentlemen out, they were speaking Spanish I knew bits and pieces of what they were saying but I got to have a short conversation with them from what I have learned in my Spanish class.

Jacqueline also had chances to converse with L1 Spanish speakers in the workplace. She recounted,

There’s some Latino men that—they’re like, maintenance workers. And so, when I’m in the office late at night, they’re in there. So, I’m more in tune to talk to them, you know. And I’ll ask them about their day and stuff. Prior to taking a Spanish class, I would say “hola” and keep it moving.

She also explained how these workplace conversations enhanced her experience of SLA:

But now, I’m trying to engage more, you know. And I know that they know that I’m not as proficient as I’m supposed to be. [laughs] But they do try, as well. So, I’m just more—. I found myself to be more interested in engaging in Spanish activities. You know—. Just wanted to learn more about the culture.

Ashley also used her L2 in the workplace to converse with L1 Spanish speakers. She confirmed, “Like, when I see somebody, like a customer will be speaking. I know that they’re speaking Spanish, and I’ll start saying the little—some words that I do know to them in Spanish.” Like the others, Ashley perceived that speaking with L1 Spanish speakers in the workplace assisted her in picking up her L2. Ashley explained,

Maybe at work, they [the Spanish speakers] might help some, because these people know that I’m trying to learn Spanish, so when they come up to me now, they’ll [ask]—
“¿Cómo estás [Ashley]?” And so they’ll start—and they’ll say things to me in Spanish, so—. Like, they’re trying to help me out.

Although many of the participants were able to practice speaking their L2 in the workplace, Danielle also had the ability to practice with her best friend, who is an L1 Spanish speaker. When asked how she would describe her experience of SLA, Danielle summed up her experience by saying, “I liked it. I feel like I learned a lot … using it outside of school, with my friend. That has made it—the class—satisfying, I guess.”

**Difficulty in Explaining the Connection between MBTI Personality Type and SLA**

All of the participants experienced some difficulty explaining the connection between their MBTI personality type and their experience of SLA. The participants were asked at the beginning of their introductory-level Spanish course about how they perceived that their MBTI personality type would either help them or hinder them from picking up their L2. The participants’ responses were often hesitant and full of pauses. Ashley replied,

Mmm—. [pause 7 s] Uh—. [pause 6 s] Hmm—. I don’t think it’ll hinder me. Um—.

How it’ll help me, is I like learning new things. Um—. [pause 6 s]. And I like the fact that it may benefit me, in the future, if I can accomplish it and get that fluency closer to 100 [percent]. [laughs] Um—. [pause 16 s] Uh—. [pause 6 s] Yeah. I guess that’s it.

Carl was also hesitant to respond. He stated, “Just um—. I guess, just—. [pause 10 s] I guess it depends. I mean, if it’s—. I guess it depends on how I’m learning it.”

Besides being hesitant with their responses, some of the participants also needed to re-read their MBTI description in order to answer the question. Jacqueline responded,

Mmm—. [pause 5 s; raps table] Maybe—. That’s a very good question. Maybe the senses? Well, no, because you got to—. I don’t know. Let me see. Um—. [pause 8 s]
Maybe sensing. Um—. [reads the MBTI description softly] “Through the five senses—.” That’s a tricky question! [laughs] [reads the MBTI description softly again]

Hannah also needed to re-read her MBTI description in order to answer the question. She responded,

[laughs] Um—. [pause 10 s] Hmm. I don’t know. Um, I guess that would be where I would flop back to the thinking instead of the feeling. [laughs] … Because it’s kind of—I don’t know. Can I read the thing again? [pauses to read the MBTI description to herself]

The participants were also asked at the end of their introductory-level Spanish course about which aspects of their MBTI personality type they believed either helped them or hindered them from picking up their L2. Just as they were at the beginning of their introductory-level Spanish course, the participants’ responses were hesitant and full of pauses. Danielle responded,

Um—I’m not sure. Let’s see. How would it pertain to my personality? I guess—. Mmm. [pause 6 s] I don’t know. [laughs] Um, it would—. Let me think about that one. Could we come back to that one? [laughs]

Several of the participants also indicated that they had forgotten their MBTI personality type over the course of the semester, which would have made it more difficult for them to describe how their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA. One participant, Evelyn, even admitted that she did not give her MBTI personality type much thought over the course of the semester. When asked how his personality type either helped him or hindered him from picking up his L2, Carl paused for 25 s before he replied, “I’m trying to think. Uh—. What did we list for my personality type again?” Carl also admitted, “I have a hard time judging my personality as it pertains to a particular thing, like a class.” Jacqueline indicated on
multiple occasions that she had forgotten her MBTI personality type. She responded to the questions about her personality type by talking softly to herself first: “I’m an extravert, visual—. … I hate this personality thing. Um—.” When responding to my question about how her personality type either helped her or hindered her from picking up her L2, Jacqueline responded, “I’m sorry. What was the other acronyms? I apologize. … I always forget it.”

Some of the participants tried using the MBTI terminology to explain how they perceived that their personality type would influence their ability to pick up an L2; however, they unintentionally misused the terminology. The function of feeling was especially difficult for some of the participants to understand. At the beginning of their introductory-level Spanish course, both Danielle and Jacqueline predicted that their preference for feeling would be the least helpful to them. Danielle incorrectly associated her preference for feeling with her emotions. She explained,

I guess my feelings [would be the least helpful]. Because, if I do make a mistake, and somebody is like, rude about it, that’s probably going to hurt my feelings, and then I’m probably not going to want to learn it anymore.

Jacqueline incorrectly associated her preference for feeling with selfishness. She explained,

I’ll go with feelings [as being the least helpful]. I’m thinking—I’m feeling that that could hurt me, that—the person-centered. If I’m constantly thinking about myself, and not others, you know. Being self-centered. I guess I’ll go with that, yeah.

The participants also tended to focus on other individual difference variables, to the exclusion of personality type, in order to explain their experience of SLA. Danielle and Jacqueline used several different variables to explain their experience, none of which they were able to associate with their MBTI personality types. Danielle suggested, “Not picking up the
language fast enough. I don’t know. … I guess not having experience in a Spanish environment until that time. … Possibly the aspect of not understanding, maybe?” Jacqueline agreed with Danielle: “I think that’s that—. The fear that I was not picking it up like I wanted to. So, I would kind of get mad at myself because I wasn’t quite understanding.” Evelyn readily admitted that she believed motivation would be more important than her personality type in picking up her L2. At the beginning of her introductory-level Spanish course, she explained:

[I’m at an advantage for picking up the L2] because I’m able to focus. Because I am motivated to take this class. These really don’t have anything to do with my personality. … I think just through hard work and perseverance, I will do well in this class.

**Exhibiting Character Traits Consistent with the Dominant Function Enhances SLA**

Although the participants could not easily explain the connection between their MBTI personality type and their experience of SLA, many of them were able to provide a list of character traits that they perceived to have enhanced their experience of SLA. When they exhibited character traits that were consistent with their dominant functions, the participants perceived that their experiences of SLA were enhanced. Table 11 lists some character traits that are associated with the MBTI functions.

Table 11

*Character Traits Associated with the MBTI Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Character Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensing (S)</td>
<td>active, concrete, factual, observant, practical, pragmatic, realistic, specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted (S_e)</td>
<td>concrete, down-to-earth, matter-of-fact, practical, pragmatic, realistic, sensible, specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverted (S_i)</td>
<td>clever, conceptual, creative*, curious, energetic, enthusiastic,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intuition (N) | Extraverted (N_e) | *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinking (T)</th>
<th>Feeling (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverted (N&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;), Introverted (T&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>Introverted (F&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imaginative, ingenious, insightful, theoretical</td>
<td>imaginative, insightful, metaphorical, theorizer, visionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex, conceptual, creative, deep, global, idealistic, imaginative, insightful, metaphorical, theorizer, visionary</td>
<td>analytical, clear and concise, critical, logical, objective, rational, reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analytical&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, contemplative&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, critical, detached, logical, objective, questioning, rational</td>
<td>analytical&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, contemplative&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, critical, detached, logical, objective, questioning, rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analytical&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, contemplative&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, critical, detached, logical, objective, questioning, rational</td>
<td>compassionate, cooperative, empathetic, helpful, kind&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;, personable&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;, sensitive, supportive, sympathetic, tactful, thoughtful, values-based, warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compassionate, cooperative, empathetic, helpful, kind&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;, personable&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;, sensitive, supportive, sympathetic, tactful, thoughtful, values-based, warm</td>
<td>caring, concerned, considerate, cooperative, friendly&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;, generous, gentle, idealistic, kind&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;, optimistic, sensitive, supportive, sympathetic, tactful, trusting, warm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Character traits adapted from *Introduction to Type.* Copyright 1998 by Copyright 1998 by I. B. Myers.

<sup>a</sup>Character traits described by Carl. <sup>b</sup>Character traits described by Ashley. <sup>c</sup>Character traits described by Danielle. <sup>d</sup>Character traits described by Evelyn.

When he exhibited character traits that were consistent with his dominant function, extraverted intuition, Carl perceived that his experience of SLA was enhanced. At the beginning of his introductory-level Spanish course, Carl perceived that being creative would enhance his experience of SLA. He explained, “If I’m learning through activities that engage me in a way that touches to the things that engage me in a creative way, then that would probably help [me pick up the L2].”

At the end of his introductory-level Spanish course, Carl maintained his belief that being given the chance to stimulate his creative side had enhanced his experience of SLA. He stated, “I guess when things were presented in a creative format, like in charts, that was able—. ‘Cause I’m a creative person, I got—. It was simplified in a creative format that helped.” He also
Carl mentioned the SuperSite, a virtual adjunct to the textbook, as a beneficial tool for him in picking up his L2. Carl explained,

> Of course, we do have the reviews in class, but I feel like most of my learning is from the Supersite thing. Like, we had that—. Because there’s that little animated cartoon professor, with those little videos [tutorials]. And so, I feel—part of me feels like I get more from those than from the actual class.

When asked for an example of a time in which he felt he had picked up his L2, Carl again turned to his creative nature. He described (and later, shared via e-mail) a PowerPoint presentation that he had created in his introductory-level Spanish course. He explained,

> At the end of the semester, we did this project. This [PowerPoint] presentation project. Where we basically had to say a bunch of stuff about ourselves, in Spanish of course … The stuff I put into my project, I felt really good coming out of it.

When she exhibited character traits that were consistent with her dominant function, introverted thinking, Ashley perceived that her experience of SLA was enhanced. At the beginning of her introductory-level Spanish course, she perceived that being contemplative would be beneficial for picking up her L2. Ashley explained,

> Because I’ve got to think about what I’m going to say. I have to think about what I’m hearing and process that, and be able to respond. Or even to start a conversation, I’ll have to think about, “Okay, what am I going to say?”

At the end of her introductory-level Spanish course, Ashley cited being analytical, another one of the character traits consistent with introverted thinking, as being beneficial in picking up her L2. Ashley supported this statement with some examples of her thought process throughout the course:
Where that part comes in, is like, with the stem-changing [verbs], stuff like that. And the preterite [tense]. I’m like, “Why do we have to do that?” [laughs] You know? It’s like, “Why?” [laughs] It doesn’t—. “Why? Can you explain to me why? Why does this word change, and why does this one not?”

When she exhibited character traits that were consistent with her dominant function, extraverted feeling, Danielle perceived that her experience of SLA was enhanced. She perceived that being personable and kind played a role in her ability to pick up her L2. Danielle explained,

Because the Spanish [speaking] people that I’ve been around are very friendly and open. And I’m like that, so I feel like it was, like a connection. [laughs] Like, it helped me to get to know the people that I know now. By being so open and friendly.

During the focus group discussion, Danielle elaborated on her belief that being personable and kind helped her pick up her L2. She revealed,

I would make new friends that were [spoke] Spanish, which is how I met my best friend. And, I feel like that helped me. … Just having a friendly personality, and I guess, being forward, and—I don’t know—not like, shy and conservative. Like, more like, outgoing and upfront. I feel like that’s what helped me, I don’t know, pick it [the L2] up I guess.

When she exhibited character traits that were consistent with her dominant function, introverted feeling, Evelyn perceived that her experience of SLA was enhanced. At the beginning of her introductory-level Spanish course, Evelyn predicted that being friendly and kind would be helpful to her when picking up her L2. She explained,

It has helped me in the past, because being sort of a quiet, reserved, but very nice person, people tend to talk to me a lot, so—. Like, my husband is Portuguese, and I would speak to his grandparents a lot, and they don’t speak English, so I end up just listening to them.
And I learn a lot from just listening. And I was able to repeat and pick up a lot of language that way. So, yeah, also being nice [will help me].

Later in the interview, Evelyn explained more about how she believed that being friendly and kind would be advantageous to her experience of SLA. She supplied, “Because I am nice to people at the hospital [where I work], they like to talk to me [in Spanish], and that gives me an opportunity to practice.”

**Exhibiting Character Traits Consistent with the E and P Attitudes Enhances SLA**

When the participants exhibited character traits that were consistent with the extraversion and perceiving attitudes of personality type, they perceived that their experience of SLA was enhanced. Table 12 lists some character traits that are consistent with the MBTI attitudes.

Table 12

*Character Traits Associated with the MBTI Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Character Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>active&lt;sup&gt;a,b,d,e&lt;/sup&gt;, enthusiastic, expressive, externally-attuned, gregarious, initiating&lt;sup&gt;a,b,c,d,e&lt;/sup&gt;, outgoing&lt;sup&gt;a,b,d&lt;/sup&gt;, sociable&lt;sup&gt;e,f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>contained, internally-attuned, intimate, introspective, receiving, reflective, private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving</td>
<td>adaptable&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;, casual, flexible, open-minded&lt;sup&gt;b,d,e&lt;/sup&gt;, spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>decisive, methodical, organized, planned, scheduled, structured, systematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Character traits adapted from *Introduction to Type*. Copyright 1998 by I. B. Myers.

<sup>a</sup>Character traits described by Danielle.  <sup>b</sup>Character traits described by Jacqueline.  <sup>c</sup>Character traits described by Hannah.  <sup>d</sup>Character traits described by Evelyn.  <sup>e</sup>Character traits described by Ashley.  <sup>f</sup>Character traits described by Carl.

Many of the participants perceived that exhibiting character traits that are consistent with the extraversion attitude would enhance their experience of SLA. At the beginning of their introductory-level Spanish course, the participants were asked which aspects of their personality
type would be the most helpful to them in picking up their L2. Danielle predicted that by being actively involved, initiating, and outgoing, her experience of SLA would be enhanced. She explained,

   People will be willing to help me learn. Because I ask a lot of questions. I’m very outgoing, and I’m like, am upfront. … I feel like, my outgoing will be most helpful, because if I make a mistake in Spanish, I can just joke about it. And hopefully—. And learn from that mistake that—. And the joke or whatever. The correct way. To say it.

Jacqueline’s response resembled that of Danielle. By being actively involved and initiating, she also believed that her experience of SLA would be enhanced. Jacqueline commented,

   It’ll help me because we need to work together as a group. … Because in case I don’t know how to speak it fluently, I know just being personable, that I’m quite sure that I can easily engage with somebody to help me.

Even the participants who indicated a preference for introversion predicted that exhibiting character traits that are consistent with the extraversion attitude would be helpful to them in picking up their L2. These participants predicted that being more initiating and outgoing could enhance their experiences of SLA. Hannah explained, “Language is something that is between people, so if you’re—you know—just kind of hanging out by yourself, it’s kind of hard to get that communication going.” Evelyn explained further:

   Well, what can be a hindrance [to picking up an L2] is not being so outgoing, and not seeking large groups of people—Spanish-speaking people—to practice with. I do like to practice Spanish with people that I meet, but you know, sort of the same blocks to making conversation that I have in English apply in Spanish. So, if I don’t know the
person very well—you know, it can be hard for me to think of things to say. So, the actual practicing Spanish can be impaired because of that. Ashley’s response also indicated that she believed that being more sociable and actively involved could enhance her experience of SLA. She commented,

In order to really make good use of the language once it’s learned, you have to—I may have to be a little more—I have to practice it more, so therefore, I’ll have to be a little more sociable, maybe? And speaking the language with other people who speak that language. And even go so far as maybe going to a Spanish-speaking country, where I’d have to use the language, too, so I can’t be too shy not to speak. You know, too quiet. You know what I’m saying?

At the end of their introductory-level Spanish course, the participants remained steadfast in their perception that exhibiting character traits that are consistent with the extraversion attitude enhanced their experience of SLA. Carl pointed out how being sociable had enhanced his experience of SLA, particularly within the FLE. Regarding giving presentations inside the FLE and producing his L2 verbally, Carl simply stated, “Well, of course, I’m a sociable guy. I’m not camera-shy or anything. I mean, I did theater in high school. So, I have no problem getting up in front of people and presenting.”

Jacqueline and Danielle discussed how being outgoing, another character trait consistent with the extraversion attitude, had enhanced their experience of SLA. Jacqueline asserted,

I think you have to have that—just that willingness to learn and not be shy to pick up the language. Because if you’re bashful and shy—. You know, Spanish—that’s a happy language. You know, they are all about good times, family, talking—. So, that means a lot. You know, to be able to dwell [sic] right into their culture without any problems,
you can’t be any shy person being like that. … And so, if I was someone that was an introvert, I don’t think I would be able to pick up the language skill as effectively, you know, as I feel that I am now, because I’m just outgoing. I can go—get down, just like they can. … So, I’m thinking personality has a lot to do with it. Picking up a language.

Danielle agreed, “I feel like personality has a lot [to do with it]. To pick up a language, anyways, you can’t be, like, all quiet about it, and just like—not even try to be friends.” Danielle also commented on the importance of being able to initiate a conversation. She stated,

I feel like my personality type put me at an advantage because I’m so friendly and open. I’m not like, shy and standing in the background or anything. … I just talk to people.

And that’s how you get stuff going, you know? Communication.

At the end of their introductory-level Spanish course, even the participants who had indicated a preference for introversion perceived that being initiating and actively involved in picking up their L2 enhanced their experience of SLA. Ashley explained, “You can’t be quiet. You got to speak. … You got to kind of get involved. Like, if the teacher’s asking questions, you need to jump in. Answer.” She continued, “So, I think I’m more getting—. That introvert is changing some to where I’m speaking a different language with people. With strangers, basically. [laughs] So—. Which is not something I would’ve done in the past.” Evelyn also perceived that it would have been beneficial for her to be more initiating and actively involved. Nevertheless, she chose not to give much attention to her nonpreferred attitude, extraversion. She explained,

Personality-wise, I feel like if I were a little bit more outgoing, I could’ve got more practice speaking. But I wasn’t. I didn’t really push for that. And [I] just went with the
flow. … I wasn’t really assertive enough to say, “Look, this is what I need. This is what I want.”

Some of the participants also perceived that exhibiting character traits associated with the perceiving attitude would enhance their experience of SLA. At the beginning of their introductory-level Spanish course, Ashley, Jacqueline, and Evelyn all predicted that open-mindedness, a character trait consistent with the perceiving attitude, would be beneficial to them in picking up their L2. Ashley acknowledged, “How it’ll help me, is I like learning new things. … I’m one of those persons who really try to apply themselves to what they’re learning, not just—and not give up on it, either.” Jacqueline also predicted that her openness would be beneficial to her in picking up her L2. She explained,

Just being warm, and just open, and just willing to learn. … I think that will help me, because I have a very easy and open personality. So, definitely having those traits will help me with my Spanish. … Just being open and warm and receptive definitely will help me.

Evelyn also predicted that her openness would be a useful personality trait to have when picking up her L2. She explained,

I tend to be open to talking to everyone that I meet. Even if the conversation doesn’t go very far, you know, I like to listen to people and sort of give them the time to talk about whatever they want. And I think that’s useful.

At the end of their introductory-level Spanish course, Ashley and Jacqueline again referenced personality traits that are consistent with the perceiving attitude as those that enhanced their experience of SLA. Jacqueline continued to mention the importance of being
open-minded, and she acknowledged that she had developed this aspect of her personality since
the last time that she had taken an L2 course. She explained,

I was more open, and I think this go-around, a little more mature. … So, it’s a difference,
I guess, in terms of how I’ve viewed taking this course, and you know, what I gained
from it. … I think it helped me in a sense that I was open and—. Even though, if I did
experience some difficulties, I didn’t let that become a challenge, you know. So, I was
willing to engage in the process.

In addition to being open-minded, Ashley believed that by being adaptable, her experience of
SLA was enhanced. She explained, “I think I’m very adaptable to learning the language. I’m just
not like, ‘Oh! I’m not going to learn it!’ There’s no wall or anything. So, I think I’m adaptable to
trying to learn.” She continued,

I think, [I am] at an advantage. I think, because I was eager to learn. I didn’t give up.
And I did, like, adapt to trying to learn it. Like, there was a class of—17 people?
Somewhere around there, I think. But by the end, there was under 10. [laughs]

**Summary of Themes**

Seven themes emerged from the interview, focus group, and electronic journal data. The
adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA perceived that:

- SLA is the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in a variety of formats
  in the L2.
- SLA refers to a range of function in the L2.
- They were apprehensive about their experience of SLA.
- Using the L2 outside of the FLE enhanced their experience of SLA.
• It was difficult to explain the connection between their MBTI personality types and their experience of SLA.
• Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with their dominant functions) enhanced their experience of SLA.
• Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with the extraversion and perceiving attitudes) enhanced their experience of SLA.

These seven themes answered the central research question: What is the essence of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA? The central research question was also broken down into six subquestions, each of which was answered by two or three of these themes.

Research Question 1

The first subquestion was: How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the beginning of an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by two of the themes, specifically:

• SLA is the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in a variety of formats in the L2.
• SLA refers to a range of function in the L2.

At the beginning of their introductory-level Spanish course, the participants described SLA as the ability to comprehend and to produce verbally in the L2. They also described SLA as a range of comprehension and production abilities in the L2. Some of the participants perceived that people who have acquired an L2 would be able to communicate with L1 speakers of the language. In addition, many of the participants perceived that people who have acquired an L2 would have the confidence to travel or even to find employment in a foreign country.

Research Question 2
The second subquestion was: In what ways do these learners anticipate that their personality type will either enhance or inhibit their experience of SLA? This subquestion was answered by three of the themes, specifically:

- It was difficult to explain the connection between their MBTI personality types and their experience of SLA.
- Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with their dominant functions) enhanced their experience of SLA.
- Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with the extraversion and perceiving attitudes) enhanced their experience of SLA.

At the beginning of their introductory-level Spanish course, the participants had a difficult time explaining how they perceived that their MBTI personality type could enhance or inhibit their experience of SLA. They were hesitant, and at times inaccurate, in their use of the MBTI terminology. Despite this, the participants were able to discuss some of the character traits that they believed would be beneficial in acquiring their L2. Ashley described how being contemplative and analytical (two character traits that are consistent with her dominant function, introverted thinking) would be useful to her in acquiring her L2. Evelyn described how being kind and friendly (two character traits that are consistent with her dominant function, introverted feeling) would be useful to her in acquiring her L2. Carl described how being creative (a character trait that is consistent with his dominant function, extraverted intuition) would be useful to him in acquiring his L2. Many of the participants described how being open-minded (a character trait that is consistent with the perceiving attitude) would be useful to them in acquiring their L2. Most of the participants—extraverts and introverts alike—also perceived that being
initiating, actively involved, sociable, or outgoing (character traits that are consistent with the extraverted attitude) would be useful to them in acquiring their L2.

**Research Question 3**

The third subquestion was: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA as they progress through an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by two of the themes, specifically:

- They were apprehensive about their experience of SLA.
- Using the L2 outside of the FLE enhanced their experience of SLA.

As the participants progressed through their introductory-level Spanish course, they revealed in their electronic journal entries that there was an overall lack of confidence in their ability to produce and to comprehend their L2. Some of the participants attributed this lack of confidence, at least in part, to the structure or format of the FLE. Understanding and using grammar effectively was a concern for many of the participants. The participants also acknowledged other sources of apprehension, including a lack of vocabulary knowledge, difficulty speaking the L2, and difficulty comprehending the spoken L2. Many of the participants also revealed in their electronic journal entries that using their L2 in some form outside of the FLE had helped them begin to acquire their L2. Some participants chose to listen in on Spanish-language conversations in order to practice their listening comprehension skills; others chose to practice their speaking and listening skills by holding their own conversations with L1 Spanish speakers.

**Research Question 4**

The fourth subquestion was: How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by two of the themes, specifically:
- SLA is the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in a variety of formats in the L2.
- SLA refers to a range of function in the L2.

At the end of their introductory-level Spanish course, the participants expanded their description of SLA as the ability to comprehend and produce comprehensibly in the L2. This expanded definition included not only the ability to comprehend and to produce the L2 in a verbal format, but also the ability to comprehend and to produce the L2 in a written format. This definition also included the ability to comprehend and to produce gestures and other non-verbal forms of the language. The participants not only acknowledged that SLA can take place in several different formats, but also that the reasons for acquiring the L2 in a certain format vary according to the L2 learners’ intent for learning the language. The participants also perceived that people who have acquired their L2 would have a range of abilities in their L2, including: the ability to travel and find employment in a foreign country, the ability to communicate effectively with L1 speakers, and even the ability to think in their L2.

**Research Question 5**

The fifth subquestion was: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by two of the themes, specifically:

- They were apprehensive about their experience of SLA.
- Using the L2 outside of the FLE enhanced their experience of SLA.

At the end of their introductory-level Spanish course, the participants acknowledged an overall lack of confidence in their L2 abilities. Some of the participants admitted that they struggled with the format and timing of the course. Most of the participants also described a lack of confidence
in their grammar abilities, specifically in the area of verb conjugation. Many of the participants admitted to having some difficulty producing their L2 verbally. They also admitted to having some difficulty comprehending their L2 in its verbal form, citing the fast pace of speech among L1 Spanish speakers. Despite the difficulties they faced, the participants perceived that using their L2 outside of the FLE enhanced their experience of SLA. The participants described several instances in which they were willing to use their L2 outside of the FLE in order to practice their verbal comprehension and production abilities.

**Research Question 6**

The sixth subquestion was: In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by three of the themes, specifically:

- It was difficult to explain the connection between their MBTI personality types and their experience of SLA.
- Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with their dominant functions) enhanced their experience of SLA.
- Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with the extraversion and perceiving attitudes) enhanced their experience of SLA.

At the end of their introductory-level Spanish course, the participants continued to have a difficult time explaining the connection between their MBTI personality type and their experience of SLA. The participants’ explanations were often hesitant and full of pauses. Some participants even explained their experience of SLA in terms of other individual difference variables, to the exclusion of personality type. However, the participants did describe their experience of SLA as it related to specific character traits, many of which are consistent with
their dominant functions. Ashley perceived that her experience of SLA was enhanced by being analytical (a character trait that is consistent with her dominant function, introverted thinking.) Danielle perceived that her experience of SLA was enhanced by being kind and personable (characters traits that are consistent with her dominant function, extraverted feeling.) Carl perceived that his experience of SLA was enhanced by being creative (a character trait that is consistent with his dominant function, extraverted intuition.) Many of the participants also perceived that their experience of SLA was enhanced when they exhibited certain character traits that are consistent with the extraversion attitude of personality type: active, initiating, sociable, and outgoing. Some of the participants also perceived that their experience of SLA was enhanced when they exhibited certain character traits that are consistent with the perceiving attitude of personality type: open-mindedness and adaptability.

Summary

This chapter addressed the results of the data analysis for this hermeneutic phenomenological study. It began with a detailed portrait of each of the six participants included in the current study. Then, the data were presented in the form of themes. Seven themes emerged from the process of phenomenological reflection. The chapter concluded with an answer to each of the six subquestions that were addressed in the study.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

This chapter begins with a summary of the findings of the data analysis for this hermeneutic phenomenological study. These findings are then considered in light of the relevant literature and theories on the topics of adult learning, SLA, and personality type. Next, the methodological and practical implications of the study are discussed. The limitations of the study are also explained. This chapter concludes with some recommendations for future research.

Summary of Findings

Seven themes emerged from the interview, focus group, and electronic journal data to describe the essence of SLA for adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA. The essence of SLA describes the perceived experiences of SLA that were shared among these learners. It also describes the learners’ perceptions of how their personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA. Seven themes emerged from the data in order to answer the six subquestions.

The first subquestion was: How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the beginning of an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by two themes:

- SLA is the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in a variety of formats in the L2.
- SLA refers to a range of function in the L2.

The second subquestion was: In what ways do these learners anticipate that their personality type will either enhance or inhibit their experience of SLA? This subquestion was answered by three themes:
• It was difficult to explain the connection between their MBTI personality types and their experience of SLA.

• Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with their dominant functions) enhanced their experience of SLA.

• Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with the extraversion and perceiving attitudes) enhanced their experience of SLA.

The third subquestion was: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA as they progress through an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by two themes:

• They were apprehensive about their experience of SLA.

• Using the L2 outside of the FLE enhanced their experience of SLA.

The fourth subquestion was: How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by two themes:

• SLA is the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in a variety of formats in the L2.

• SLA refers to a range of function in the L2.

The fifth subquestion was: How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by two themes:

• They were apprehensive about their experience of SLA.

• Using the L2 outside of the FLE enhanced their experience of SLA.

The sixth subquestion was: In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course? This subquestion was answered by three themes:
Discussion

It is necessary to discuss these seven themes in light of the relevant theories and literature on the topics of adult learning, SLA, and personality type. In particular, these themes are discussed as they relate to Knowles’ theory of andragogy, Krashen’s Monitor Theory of adult SLA, and Jung’s type theory of personality. Because the participants in this study took the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire to determine their personality type, it is also necessary to include Briggs’ and Myers’ interpretation of type theory and type dynamics in this discussion.

The adult learners in an FLE at CCVA perceived that SLA is the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in the L2. The learners agreed that SLA usually involves the comprehension and the production of the L2 in its verbalized form, although it could also include the comprehension and the production of the L2 in other, non-verbalized forms. These learners perceived that the ability to comprehend the L2 and the ability to produce the L2 were both necessary for SLA to take place. Although it can be said that these learners achieved a balanced view of SLA, their perception that both comprehension and production are essential to SLA is actually contrary to Krashen’s intake hypothesis. Krashen (2002) posited that although the intake of information is fundamental to SLA, the output (or production) of the L2 is not essential to SLA. According to Krashen (2002), it is theoretically possible for a language learner to acquire a
level of competence in their L2 without ever being able to produce the language in either a verbal or a written format.

The adult learners in an FLE at CCVA also perceived that SLA refers to a range of function in the L2. They perceived that the extent of L2 comprehension and production abilities varies by language learner. Krashen (2009) noted that language comprehension normally precedes language production. Therefore, it is possible that some language learners may not acquire enough of their L2 to actually be able to produce the language in any form. This was noted by Jacqueline, who revealed during one of her interviews that although some of her classmates were able to understand the written form of the language, they had some difficulty speaking it. Nevertheless, many of these learners perceived that acquiring an L2 meant being able to communicate or converse with L1 speakers of the language. They believed that in order to engage in conversations with L1 Spanish speakers, they would have to be able both to comprehend and to produce their L2. In one of her interviews, Ashley made a distinction between the ability to engage in a routine dialogue (e.g. “Hi, how are you?” or “What’s your name?”) and the ability to engage in an actual conversation. Indeed, Krashen posited that engaging in an actual conversation means having some control over the topic of conversation, which requires a significant amount of comprehensible intake. He further posited that producing the language in conversation actually promotes greater intake, which he stated is the essential element of SLA.

The adult learners in an FLE at CCVA also perceived that they were apprehensive about their experience of SLA, especially in terms of verbal comprehension and production. One source of apprehension that was shared among these learners was the fast rate of speech used by L1 Spanish speakers. If, as Krashen (2002) asserted, comprehensible intake is fundamental to
SLA, then these learners’ apprehension about the fast rate of speech among L1 speakers has merit. When the input is too fast for them to be able to comprehend, it simply becomes noise, which provides the language learners with no benefits of L2 acquisition. Another source of apprehension among these learners was their perceived inability to produce comprehensibly in their L2. This is plausible, as Krashen asserted that forcing language learners to produce too early (i.e., before they have built up enough comprehensible input) can be anxiety-provoking. Many of the learners also attributed their feelings of apprehension to the course content itself—most notably, the grammar concepts. However, Krashen asserted that subconscious language acquisition is not concerned with form, but rather with the message that is being conveyed and understood. Therefore, the learners’ perceived apprehension toward the course content could actually be described as apprehension toward the conscious act of second language learning (SLL), and not toward the subconscious act of SLA.

Krashen (2009) suggested that adult learners who are just beginning to learn an L2 usually understand much more input in an FLE than in an informal (or natural) learning environment. However, the FLE does have its limitations, and Krashen suggested that the goal of the FLE is “not to substitute for the outside world, but to bring students to the point where they can begin to use the outside world for further acquisition, to where they can begin to understand the language used on the outside” (p. 59). Many of the adult learners in an FLE at CCVA chose to utilize the outside (or natural) world to enhance their experience of SLA. Some of these learners described their experiences of eavesdropping on L1 Spanish speakers’ conversations as a way to try to better comprehend the verbalized language. Others described their experiences of starting conversations with L1 Spanish speakers as a way to practice both their L2 listening skills and their L2 speaking skills. Although both approaches are useful in that they provide the
language learner with the chance to obtain comprehensible input outside of the FLE, Krashen explained that the act of engaging in a conversation with an L1 speaker is much more effective than eavesdropping, because it allows the language learner to have some control over the input. That is, the language learner can signal to the L1 speaker that he is having trouble understanding what is being said—something that is impossible to do when eavesdropping.

The adult learners in an FLE at CCVA perceived that it was difficult to explain the connection between their experience of SLA and their personality type. Instead of focusing solely on how they perceived that their MBTI personality type either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA, many of these learners discussed the role of other factors, such as motivation, on their experience of SLA. This is reasonable, given that Knowles’ (1970) theory of andragogy embraced the adult learners’ need to be internally motivated. Motivation is also known to be a factor related to SLA success (Krashen, 2009), and it has been the focus of many studies on SLA in recent years (Engin, 2009; Erton, 2010; Roberts & Meyer, 2012). Still, Briggs (1926) asserted that the principles of Jung’s type theory of personality are useful when applied to education and learning. According to Briggs, learning about oneself through Jung’s type theory is “a most valuable experience … and not too difficult if approached gradually and from the proper angle” (p.126). Therefore, it was important to delve deeper to discover these learners’ perceptions of the connection between their experience of SLA and their MBTI personality type.

Although the participants could not easily explain the connection between their MBTI personality type and their experience of SLA, they did reveal character traits that they perceived to have enhanced their experience. After revisiting these learners’ MBTI personality types, it is evident that these learners opted to reveal character traits that are consistent with their dominant functions. Carl perceived that being creative had enhanced his experience. His dominant
function, extraverted intuition, is associated with being clever, conceptual, creative, curious, energetic, enthusiastic, imaginative, ingenious, insightful, and theoretical (Myers, 1998). Ashley perceived that being both contemplative and analytical had enhanced her experience. Her dominant function, introverted thinking, is associated with being analytical, contemplative, critical, detached, logical, objective, questioning, and rational (Myers, 1998). Evelyn perceived that being friendly and kind had enhanced her experience. Her dominant function, introverted feeling, is associated with being caring, concerned, considerate, cooperative, friendly, generous, gentle, idealistic, kind, optimistic, sensitive, supportive, sympathetic, tactful, trusting, and warm (Myers, 1998). Danielle perceived that being kind and personable had enhanced her experience. Her dominant function, extraverted feeling, is associated with being compassionate, cooperative, empathetic, helpful, kind, personable, sensitive, supportive, sympathetic, tactful, thoughtful, values-based, and warm (Myers, 1998). Given that a person’s dominant function is the most developed of the four functions, it is not surprising that these learners perceived that character traits that are associated with their dominant function had enhanced their experience of SLA. Not only is the dominant function the most consciously used of the four functions, but it is also the one that people tend to trust over the other, less developed functions (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014).

The learners in an FLE at CCVA also revealed some other character traits that they perceived to have enhanced their experience of SLA, many of which are consistent with the extraverted attitude of personality type. According to Myers (1998), extraversion is associated with being active, enthusiastic, expressive, externally-attuned, gregarious, initiating, outgoing, and sociable. Danielle and Jacqueline both revealed that being initiating, actively involved, and outgoing had enhanced their experience of SLA. Carl also revealed that being outgoing had
enhanced his experience. By initiating conversations with L1 Spanish speakers and by being actively involved in gaining comprehensible intake and in producing their L2, these learners perceived that they had improved their SLA abilities. This is consistent with Krashen’s (2002) position that factors that are related to SLA are those that encourage L2 intake and enable the performer to utilize the L2. Ashley, Evelyn, and Hannah agreed that exhibiting these character traits could have enhanced their experience of SLA. In fact, Ashley mentioned that she had made a concerted effort to exhibit these traits more often in order to enhance her experience. Evelyn, on the other hand, perceived that her experience of SLA actually may have been hindered because she opted not to exhibit these traits very often.

Other character traits that these learners believed to have enhanced their experience of SLA are consistent with the perceiving attitude of personality type. According to Myers (1998), the perceiving attitude is associated with being adaptable, casual, flexible, open-minded, and spontaneous. Ashley, Evelyn, and Jacqueline all perceived that being open to learning the L2 had enhanced their experience of SLA. Ashley also believed that being adaptable was an important factor in acquiring her L2. This is in line with Dulay and Burt’s affective filter hypothesis (as cited in Krashen, 2002), which posited that an “affective filter” acts to prevent comprehensible input from being used for language acquisition. The lower the level of the affective filter, the greater the chance is of acquiring the L2. Krashen (2002) explained the hypothesis by stating, “The acquirer must not only understand the input but must also, in a sense, be ‘open’ to it” (p. 21).

Implications

The results of this study have many methodological and practical implications. The adult learners in an FLE at CCVA perceived that they were apprehensive about their experience of
SLA in terms of both the comprehension and the production of the verbalized L2. Krashen (2002) asserted that providing adult L2 learners with comprehensible input is fundamental to SLA. However, the adult learners in an FLE at CCVA perceived that the rate of speech of L1 Spanish speakers was much too fast for them to comprehend. Hatch (as cited in Krashen, 2009) explained how simplifying input by using a slower rate of speech and by articulating clearly can promote comprehension among L2 learners. Although L1 Spanish speakers outside of the FLE may not always simplify their input, it does place the onus on the professors in the FLE to change the way they provide their input, especially for beginning L2 learners. Professors who teach introductory-level L2 courses should ensure that they articulate their words clearly, slow down their rate of speech, and use high-frequency words in order to promote verbal comprehension of the L2.

The results of this study could also justify the need for a revised syllabus for introductory-level L2 courses at community colleges across the state. The revamped syllabus would provide more practical applications for utilizing the L2. Knowles (1970) asserted that the emphasis for adult learning should be on experiential learning and simulations of real-world experiences. Moreover, the results of this study reveal a desire for adult L2 learners to utilize their L2 in real-world situations such as the workplace. Therefore, relatable, real-world topics should be central to the course program. Such topics are often left off the syllabus, however, because they are considered too complex for introductory-level L2 learners. In fact, input for adult L2 learners “is more complicated grammatically, contains a wider range of vocabulary, deals with more complex topics, and is generally harder to understand” (Krashen, 2009, p. 58). Therefore, professors who teach introductory-level L2 courses would need to provide these adult L2 learners with the appropriate tools to be able to comprehend more complex input.
Recognizing cognates and searching for context clues are two examples of L2 learning strategies that must be incorporated into the curriculum for any introductory-level L2 course.

The revamped introductory-level L2 syllabus should provide adult L2 learners with an opportunity to comprehend and to produce the verbalized L2 through interactions with the professor and with other students; it should also provide these learners with an opportunity to practice interacting with L1 speakers. The current syllabus includes audio-visual activities in which the L2 learners listen to a conversation and answer questions about what they understood. This activity merely simulates an experience in which the L2 learners are eavesdropping on an L1 conversation; it does not simulate an experience in which the L2 learners can engage in a conversation with an L1 speaker. This calls for a change in the format of the technology, in which the L2 learners would be able to signal a need to change the phrasing or the rate of speech that is used, either by gesture or by command. Although this does not replace the need for these learners to utilize their L2 outside of the FLE, it would provide them with the skills they need to adjust to the speech of L1 speakers in these situations.

The adult learners in an FLE at CCVA perceived that it was difficult to explain the connection between their MBTI personality type and their experience of SLA. The learners were given both an online interpretation and an in-person interpretation of their MBTI results at the beginning of the semester. Nonetheless, some of the learners forgot their MBTI type over the course of the semester; others misused the MBTI terminology to explain their experience of SLA. Because knowing and understanding personality type allows adult learners to be able to select subjects, majors, and careers that suit their preferences (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014), it would be beneficial for community colleges to include the MBTI personality questionnaire as part of the curriculum for the student development courses. Many community
colleges offer student development or study skills classes; in fact, it is a requirement for graduation at any community college in Virginia (Virginia Community College System, 2015). However, only one participant in this study had taken the MBTI personality questionnaire through her required Student Development course; the other participants had never taken it before. It would certainly be advantageous for community colleges to provide more accessibility to the MBTI questionnaire for students who are initiating their community college experience. In addition, student enrollment advisors should be required to meet with each learner individually at the beginning of the their college careers in order to discuss how personality type preferences (including the way people prefer to take in and make decisions) can play a factor in classroom learning. When learners know and understand these preferences and can integrate them into their classroom experience, learning is enhanced (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014).

The adult L2 learners in an FLE at CCVA also perceived that exhibiting character traits that are consistent with the extraversion and perceiving attitudes enhanced their experience of SLA. However, not all adult learners taking an introductory-level L2 course have preferences for both extraversion and perceiving, and some of these learners may have preferences for neither of these two attitudes of personality. In fact, in a sample drawn from the respondents of the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire, only 53.8% were reported to have a preference for the extraversion attitude, and only 46.9% were reported to have a preference for the perceiving attitude (Schaubhut et al., 2009). Educators should consider the needs of all the learners in the classroom, and should vary their teaching approaches to meet these learners’ differing needs (Myers & Briggs Foundation, 2014). In order to do this, professors should ask the adult learners at the beginning of the semester about their MBTI personality types and their learning preferences. Professors should also make their own MBTI personality type and teaching
preferences known to the learners. Disclosing such information allows all individuals the opportunity to adjust to the climate of the classroom. Professors who teach introductory-level L2 courses should not only be aware of the students who prefer the introversion and judging attitudes of personality, but they should also consider ways to make acquiring the L2 easier and more meaningful for them. For example, learners who prefer introversion may gain input and produce output better in a written format rather than in a verbal format. Professors who teach introductory-level L2 courses could differentiate their methods of instruction for these introverted learners by allowing them to participate in a manner that makes them feel more comfortable. These professors could also differentiate their methods of evaluation by allowing the introverted learners to produce the L2 in their preferred, written format more so than in their less preferred, verbal format. Learners who prefer judging may feel that their experience of SLA in an FLE is enhanced when the professor presents the information in a structured classroom format. Professors who teach introductory-level L2 courses could differentiate their instruction for these learners by ensuring that they provide opportunities for structured note-taking and lectures. These professors could also differentiate their evaluation for these learners by replacing some of the performance-based assessments with more structured examinations.

**Limitations**

Qualitative research findings, by their very nature, are highly context and case dependent (Patton, 2002). The main limitations of this study, therefore, were those that were inherent to qualitative research, and to phenomenological research in particular.

One important limitation to consider was the sample size of this study. Due to the small number of participants, the findings may not be transferrable to other adult L2 learners in an FLE. The criterion sampling procedure that was used in this study could have limited
participation to an extent, although the criteria were broad enough to allow most prospective participants to become eligible for the study. However, participation in this study could have been limited due to the voluntary nature of the study, including the ability for participants to drop out of the study at any time without penalty. Only a small percentage of those who were invited to participate in the study expressed an interest in participating; an even smaller percentage actually consented to participate by returning the letter of informed consent. In addition, the time commitment that was required for data collection could have been a deterrent for some of the prospective participants (as well as for those who were initially interested in the study). However, I minimized this effect by offering compensation for the participants’ time. The use of audio and visual recording equipment during the interviews also could have been a deterrent for some of the prospective participants. However, I minimized this effect by letting the prospective participants know that pseudonyms would be used throughout the study to ensure confidentiality.

Participation in this study also was likely to be limited due to the recruitment methods that were used. The initial recruitment e-mail was intended to be sent during the first week of the semester to students who were enrolled in an introductory-level Spanish course. This would have given the prospective participants at least four weeks to turn in their letter of informed consent, to turn in their preliminary questionnaire, to take the MBTI Complete personality questionnaire, and to complete the primary interview. However, this e-mail was not sent by CCVA until the second week of each semester. According to CCVA, this was due to the large number of students who add and drop courses during the first week of any given semester. Unfortunately, this decision limited the time I had to recruit participants, giving prospective participants only three weeks in which to complete these tasks. Another limitation concerning the recruitment of participants was that all recruitment needed to be done via e-mail. Because CCVA had 10
different professors teaching the introductory-level Spanish course on three different campuses (as well as an online introductory-level Spanish course), I was not permitted to recruit by going into the classrooms. Despite this, I made every effort to recruit as many participants as possible. I requested permission to pass out fliers (with no response from the authorities at CCVA). Understanding that the only permissible recruitment method was via e-mail, I also requested that CCVA send a second recruitment e-mail at the end of the third week of the semester in order to secure more participants. Finally, I encouraged those who were participating in the study to remind their classmates about the opportunity to participate in the study.

Another important limitation to consider was the subjective nature of qualitative research. Several methods were used to lessen the effect of researcher bias on the data analysis, including having the interview transcripts and themes reviewed by an external auditor as well as by the participants themselves through member checking. The use of bracketing, or epoché, was also used in order to reduce researcher bias and to better understand the participants’ perceptions of their experience of SLA.

Another limitation to this study was the participants’ lack of understanding of their MBTI personality type. Although this information was explained to the participants during the primary interview, it was not reviewed with them over the course of the semester. As a result, many of the participants forgot their MBTI personality type (and its meaning) by the end of the semester, making it difficult for them to answer some of the interview questions and to reflect on their personality type as a whole.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Several recommendations could be made for future research in the areas of SLA and personality type. One recommendation would be to extend the length of time needed to complete
the study. The current study sought to address the perceived experience of SLA for adult L2 learners during and after a single semester of introductory-level Spanish. However, many adult L2 learners also advance to take a second semester of the language. Given that the adult L2 learners in this study perceived that SLA was as a range of function in their L2, it would be interesting to note how adult L2 learners perceive that they progress in their L2 as they continue their study of the language.

Another recommendation would be to complete a case study on a single participant’s perception of the experience of SLA and how personality type either enhances or inhibits this experience. This type of study would likely need to encompass at least the first two semesters of study in the L2. It would necessitate a full commitment on the part of both the participant and the researcher. A more in-depth discussion about personality type, to include type dynamics, would be necessary. Although there would be no focus group, the participant would need to complete more electronic journal entries and interviews, as well as periodic surveys about the perceived experience of SLA.

Finally, there are several opportunities to complete replication studies. The current study focused specifically on the perceived experiences of SLA for adult learners taking Spanish as an L2 at a single community college in Virginia. This study could be replicated with adult learners who are taking Spanish as an L2 at other community colleges across the state and across the country. It could also be replicated at the current location by substituting any other introductory-level L2 course (e.g., Arabic, Chinese, French, or German) in place of Spanish.

Future researchers who desire to complete replication studies or other similar studies involving SLA and MBTI personality type should take the necessary steps to ensure that the participants both know and understand their personality type. They should include a reminder of
the participants’ MBTI personality type as well as a short type description in all communications. A seventh subquestion, “In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA as they progress through an introductory-level L2 course?” should also be added to ensure the focus on both SLA and personality type throughout the entire study. This subquestion can be answered by changing the prompt for the electronic journal entries to include a reflection question on how the participants perceive that their MBTI personality type has enhanced or inhibited their experience of SLA.

Summary

This chapter began with a summary of the findings of the data analysis for this hermeneutic phenomenological study. This was done by answering each of the subquestions with a series of themes. These findings were then considered in light of the relevant literature and theories on the topics of adult learning, SLA, and personality type. The methodological and practical implications of the study were also discussed. The results of the current study justify the benefits of including the MBTI questionnaire as part of the curriculum for student development or study skills courses at community colleges. The results also justify the need for a revised syllabus for introductory-level L2 courses across the state. Study limitations were discussed, and some recommendations for future research were presented.
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Dear Prospective Participant:

As a graduate student in the School of Education at Liberty University, I am conducting research as part of the requirements for a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree. The purpose of my research is to determine how students at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College (JSRCC) who are taking a foreign language class would describe their experience of picking up the language and to determine how these students would perceive that their personality type influences this experience. I am writing to invite you to participate in my study.

In order to participate in the study, you must (a) be 18 years or older and (b) speak English as your first language. If you meet the eligibility criteria and are willing to participate, you will be asked to sign a letter of informed consent to participate, complete a preliminary questionnaire, and complete the online Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) Complete personality assessment. Those who are selected for an in-depth study based on the results of the personality assessment will also be asked to participate in two interviews and to complete three electronic journal entries over the course of the semester. A select few individuals will also be asked to participate in a focus group discussion and/or to meet with me to check my results for accuracy. It should take approximately 5-10 minutes for you to complete the preliminary questionnaire and 45-60 minutes to complete the personality assessment; however, the personality assessment does not have to be completed in one sitting. The journal entries should take approximately 10-15 minutes each to complete. Interviews and focus groups should take approximately 30 minutes each to complete. Your participation will be confidential, and the only personal information that will be requested for participation is your choice of e-mail address and your mailing address (if you wish to receive compensation).

To participate, please sign and return the attached consent document to your Spanish professor. You may then contact me at rlshisler@liberty.edu to request the preliminary questionnaire.

If you are initially eligible for this study and choose to participate, you will receive a $10 gas card. Those who are selected for further study (interviews, journals, and/or focus groups) and choose to participate will also be entered into a drawing for a chance to win a $100 gift card to JSRCC’s bookstore.

Warmest Regards,

Rebecca L. Shisler, Ed.S.
Doctoral Candidate, Liberty University
APPENDIX B

Letter of Informed Consent

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from 7/17/14 to 7/16/15
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CONSENT FORM

A HERMENEUTIC PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY ON THE PERCEPTION OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND PERSONALITY TYPE BY ADULT SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN A FORMAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Rebecca L. Shisler
Liberty University
School of Education

You are invited to be in a research study on personality type and the experience of picking up a second language in a college-level foreign language course. You were selected as a possible participant because you are enrolled in an introductory-level Spanish course at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College (JSRCC). I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Rebecca L. Shisler, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Liberty University is conducting this study.

Background Information:
The purpose of this study is to determine how students at JSRCC who are taking a foreign language course would describe their experience of picking up the language and to determine how these students would perceive that their personality type influences this experience.

Procedures:
If you agree to be in this study, I would ask you to:

- Sign and return this letter of consent.
- Complete a preliminary questionnaire (which should take no longer than 5-10 minutes) and return it to the me via e-mail: rlshisler@liberty.edu

Those who are initially eligible to participate (based on the preliminary questionnaire) will then be asked to:

- Take the online MBTI Complete personality assessment. This personality assessment is being offered to you free of charge. It takes approximately 45-60 minutes to complete, and it does not have to be completed in one sitting. However, it must be completed before the end of the third week of your introductory-level Spanish course. The MBTI Complete is a 93-item self-report questionnaire with no “right” or “wrong” answers. You will receive a score report and interactive feedback to help you identify your strengths as well as potential areas for personal growth.
Those selected for further study (based on the responses on the preliminary questionnaire and on the MBTI Complete) would also be asked to do the following things:

- Complete two 30-minute, audio-recorded interviews. The first interview will be completed before the end of the first month of the course, and the second interview will be completed at the end of the course.
- Complete three electronic journal entries using Penzu classroom. There is no cost associated with setting up a Penzu journal account. Journal entries need to be completed every three weeks, and they should take no more than 10-15 minutes to complete.

Some participants will also be asked to complete the following activities:

- Participate in a focus group discussion at the end of the course. The focus group will take approximately 30 minutes, and will be audio-recorded and video-recorded.
- Meet with me after an interview or group discussion to review my findings for accuracy. This should take approximately 30 minutes.

**Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:**
The risks of being in this study are minimal, and are no greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine psychological examinations or tests.

There are no direct benefits to participation in this research study. The possible benefits to society include the chance for participants to identify their personality preferences, their potential strengths, and their areas for personal growth. This study may also benefit JSRCC and other community colleges by adding to the knowledge base on foreign language and psychology.

**Compensation:**
You will receive payment for your participation in this study. Those who are initially eligible for the study and choose to participate will receive a $10 gas card. Those who are selected for further study (interviews, journals, and/or focus groups) and choose to participate will also be entered into a drawing for a chance to win a $100 gift certificate to JSRCC’s bookstore. All compensation will be given out at the completion of the study.

You may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Participants will be contacted via e-mail at the end of the study for the purpose of compensation. Personal information (e.g., mailing addresses) will only be used for the purpose of compensation, and they will be automatically deleted from my e-mail as soon as the payment is sent.

**Confidentiality:**
The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records.
To ensure the anonymity of all participants in the study, pseudonyms will be given to each prospective participant as well as to the research site. Participants will use this pseudonym when completing the MBTI Complete as well as when writing in the Penzu electronic journals. By emphasizing to all participants at the outset of the study as well as during the focus group itself that all identities should be kept anonymous and that all comments made during the focus group should be kept confidential, every effort will be made to maintain anonymity and confidentiality of the participants.
The audio-recordings of the interviews, the audio-recording of the focus group, and the video-recording of the focus group will be kept confidential. The purpose of the audio-recording device is to ensure the accuracy of transcription. The purpose of the video-recording device is to ensure that I have attributed the focus group responses to the correct people. I will also remind the participants of the audio or video recordings during each data collection session in case the participants would prefer not to be recorded.

All records and data (including audio and video recordings, personality inventories, interview transcripts, focus group transcripts, and journals) will be secured either on a password-protected computer or in a locked file cabinet. All audio and video recordings will be deleted three years from the end of the research study. All other data will also be destroyed after a period of three years from the completion of the study. The analysis of the data will be used for the purpose of my doctoral dissertation, and it may also be used in the future for the purposes of writing a manuscript on foreign languages and personality type.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University or [ ]. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

How to Withdraw from the Study:
If participants withdraw from the study, the audio-recorded files from the interviews will be deleted. The transcriptions will be deleted from my computer and their responses will not be used in the study. The focus group is the final task of the study, and not all participants will be required to complete it. Participants who choose to complete the focus group and then withdraw will remain on the video-tape and audio-tape because it would be difficult to remove them without deleting the entire discussion. However, their responses will be deleted from the written transcription, and they will not be used in the study.

Contacts and Questions:
The researcher conducting this study is Rebecca L. Shisler. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact her at rlshisler@liberty.edu.

You may also contact the advisor of the study:

Dr. Mark Lamport
(616) 238-2532
malamport@liberty.edu

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board: [ ].

Please notify the researcher if you would like a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:
I have read and understood the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

☐ The researcher has my permission to audio-record and/or video-record me as part of my participation in this study.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ______________
Signature of Investigator: ___________________________ Date: ______________
APPENDIX C

Preliminary Questionnaire

Please send the completed preliminary questionnaire to the primary investigator via e-mail: rlshisler@liberty.edu

1. What is your age?
   [ ] < 18 years
   [ ] 18-24 years
   [ ] 25-34 years
   [ ] 35-44 years
   [ ] 45-64 years
   [ ] > 65 years

2. What is your gender?
   [ ] Male
   [ ] Female
   [ ] I would prefer not to answer.

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   [ ] White/not of Hispanic origin
   [ ] Black/not of Hispanic origin
   [ ] Asian/Pacific Islander
   [ ] Hispanic
   [ ] I would prefer not to answer.
   [ ] Other: ______________________________________________________________________

4. What is your first (native) language?
   [ ] English
   [ ] Spanish
   [ ] Other: ______________________________________________________________________

5. What previous classroom experience do you have with a second (foreign) language? Check all that apply.
   [ ] I have taken a foreign language class in Elementary, Middle, or High School.
   [ ] I have taken a foreign language class in college.
   [ ] I have never taken a foreign language class before.

6. How long has it been since you have taken a second (foreign) language in the classroom?
   [ ] Less than 5 years
   [ ] 5-10 years
   [ ] More than 10 years
   [ ] I have never taken a foreign language class before.

7. What experience (other than in a classroom) do you have with a second (foreign) language? Check all that apply.
   [ ] I have lived abroad in a foreign country.
   [ ] I speak more than one language at home.
   [ ] I have not previously been exposed to a language other than English.
8. How would you describe your personality?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

Sample Questions- MBTI Step I (Form M)

Sample Items

From the

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Instrument® Form M

By Katharine C. Briggs and Isabel Briggs-Myers

Your answers will help show you how you like to look at things and how you like to go about deciding things. There are no “right” and “wrong” answers to these questions. Knowing your own preferences and learning about other people’s can help you understand what your strengths are, what kinds of work you might enjoy, and how people with different preferences can relate to one another and contribute to society.

Part I: Which answer comes closest to telling how you usually feel or act?

16. Are you inclined to
   A. value sentiment more than logic, or
   B. value logic more than sentiment?

20. Do you prefer to
   A. arrange dates, parties, etc., well in advance, or
   B. be free to do whatever looks like fun when the time comes?

Part II: Which word in each pair appeals to you more? Think about what the words mean, not about how they look or sound.

36. A. systematic
    B. casual

58. A. sensible
    B. fascinating

Part III: Which answer comes closest to describing how you usually feel or act?

59. When you start a big project that is due in a week, do you
   A. take time to list the separate things to be done and the order of doing them, or
   B. plunge right in?

67. At parties do you
   A. do much of the talking, or
   B. let others do most of the talking?
Part IV: Which word in each pair appeals to you more? Think about what words mean, not about how they look or how they sound.

79. A. imaginative  
    B. realistic  

91. A. devoted  
    B. determined  

The sample items listed above were taken from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator® Form M Item Booklet, by Katharine C. Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers, copyright 1998 by Peter B Myers and Katharine D. Myers. All rights are reserved. Further reproduction is prohibited without written consent of the publisher, CPP, Inc.

You may change the format of these items to your needs, but the wording may not be altered. You may not present these items to your readers as any kind of “mini-assessment.” This permission only allows you to use these copyrighted items as an illustrative sample of items from this instrument. We have provided these items as samples so that we may maintain control over which items appear in the published media. This avoids an entire instrument appearing at once or in segments which may be pieced together to form a working instrument, protecting the validity and reliability for the instrument. Thank you for your cooperation. CPP, Inc. Licensing Department

MBTI, Myers-Briggs, and Myers-Briggs Type Indicator are trademarks or registered trademarks of the Myers-Briggs Foundation in the United States and other countries.
Sample Item Request Form

Date: 05/18/14
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Telephone Number: [Redacted]  Fax Number: [Redacted]
Email Address: [Redacted]  CPP Customer Number: [Redacted]

Specific title, form, and edition of the instrument for which sample items are needed: MBITS

Complete (R) Form M

Sample items will be published in: (Quasi-R) Thesis  Research Project  Other

Title of Project or Article or Publication: "A Phenomenological Study on the Perception of Second Language Acquisition and Personality Type in Adult Learners with No Previous Formal Instruction in a Second Language."

If permission is granted by CPP, Inc. ("CPP") the following terms and conditions will apply:

1. CPP will issue pre-selected sample items for the assessment requested. Only these sample items may be used.
2. Permission is limited to only the one-time use specifically described above.
3. You agree to use a credit line supplied by CPP whenever sample items appear.
4. This permission does not include any commercial or for-profit use of the sample items.
5. There is no fee associated with this permission.
6. You assume responsibility for any misuse of the sample items you use pursuant to this agreement. CPP shall not be responsible for your use or misuse of the sample items.
7. You agree that the sample items as provided by CPP and used by you pursuant to this agreement remain the property of CPP.
8. You agree not to adapt, modify, translate, alter, or change the sample items in any way.

I hereby request permission from CPP for sample items as described above and agree to the terms outlined above for such research use:

Signature: [Redacted]
Date: 05/18/14

CPP, Inc. hereby grants use permission under the terms stated above for the sample items you have requested.

Signature: [Redacted]
Date: 05/18/14
APPENDIX E

IRB Approval

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

July 17, 2014

Rebecca Lynne Shisler
IRB Approval 1921.071714: A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Study on the Perception of Second Language Acquisition and Personality Type by Adult Learners with No Previous Formal Instruction in a Second Language

Dear Rebecca,

We are pleased to inform you that your above study has been approved by the Liberty IRB. This approval is extended to you for one year. If data collection proceeds past one year, or if you make changes in the methodology as it pertains to human subjects, you must submit an appropriate update form to the IRB. The forms for these cases were attached to your approval email.

Please retain this letter for your records. Also, if you are conducting research as part of the requirements for a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, this approval letter should be included as an appendix to your completed thesis or dissertation.

Thank you for your cooperation with the IRB, and we wish you well with your research project.

Sincerely,

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

Liberty University | Training Champions for Christ since 1971
Good Afternoon Rebecca,

This email is to inform you that your request to change the name of your study from A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Study on the Perception of Second Language Acquisition and Personality Type by Adult Learners with No Previous Formal Instruction in a Second Language to A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Study on the Perception of Second Language Acquisition and Personality Type by Adult Second Language Learners in a Formal Learning Environment; to include participants who have taken a foreign language course in elementary, middle, or high school; and to change the number of electronic participant journal entries from five to three has been approved. Thank you for submitting your signed change in protocol form and your revised recruitment, consent, and questionnaire. Your stamped, revised consent form is attached.

Thank you for complying with the IRB’s requirements for making changes to your approved study. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions.

Best,

[Signature]

Liberty University | Training Champions for Christ since 1971
APPENDIX F

Request to Conduct Research

Name of Requestor: Rebecca Shisler

Organization: Liberty University

Title of Research Project: A Hermeneutic Phenomenological Study on the Perception of Second Language Acquisition and Personality Type by Adult Learners with No Previous Formal Instruction in a Second Language

Brief Purpose of the Study:
The purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological study will be to describe the perceived experience of second language acquisition for adult learners at the Community College of Virginia (a pseudonym) with no previous formal instruction in a second language and to describe how these learners perceive that their personality type either enhances or inhibits their experience of second language acquisition.

Submit this form a written proposal detailing the methodology to be used, manner of obtaining consent from subjects, resources needed, and expected outcomes/benefits of the study. Also include documentation of approval from the Institutional Research Board (IRB) of your sponsoring institution/organization.

I agree to the following terms and conditions:
• Class time will not be used for any research activities, unless participation in the research is both educationally valuable and a natural part of the course content. If use of class time is requested, the researcher in consultation with the AVP of PIE, will secure the approval of the appropriate faculty member(s) before proceeding.
• All research will be conducted to the highest ethical standards. [redacted] students, faculty, and staff participating in research must be fully informed as to the purpose of the research, risks and benefits, and what participation will entail; give their consent to participate; and be free to withdraw from the research at any time.
• [redacted] its students, faculty, and staff involved as subjects in research will not be identified when findings are presented or published.
• The researcher agrees to provide documentation of subjects’ consent to the Office of the AVP of PIE in a mutually agreeable format.
• The researcher agrees to inform the college when the research is complete and to provide a copy of the results of the study. A summary of the results may be made public by the college.

Signature of Requestor: [redacted] Date: 6/21/14

Approved by: [redacted] Date: 7/2/14

Denied by: [redacted] Date:

Reason for Denial:

Form No. 52-0041, Rev. March 2013
APPENDIX G

Interview Guide: Primary Interview

Purpose:

The purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological study will be to describe the perceived experience of second language acquisition (SLA) for adult second language (L2) learners in a formal learning environment (FLE) at the Community College of Virginia (CCVA) and to describe how these learners perceive that their personality type either enhances or inhibits their experience of SLA.

Subquestions Addressed:

• How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the beginning of an introductory-level Spanish course?
• In what ways do these learners anticipate that their personality type will either enhance or inhibit their experience of SLA?

Interview Script/Questions:

1.) This will be the first of two interviews for this study, and it will also serve as the method for interpreting your Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) results. It will be audio-recorded for accuracy; is that OK?

2.) Tell me a little about yourself.
   - What is your age?
   - How long have you taken classes at this community college?
   - What major/degree are you pursuing?
   - What is your current job?
   - What are your future career plans?
   - Have you taken a foreign language class before this one? If so, how long ago was it?

3.) This study is about second language acquisition. In everyday terms, this can be described as “picking up a second language.” What does this mean to you, as a student who just started taking an introductory-level Spanish class?
   - How would you know if someone has “picked up” a language?
   - What would someone who has “picked up” a language be able to do?
   - How well would someone who has “picked up” a language be able to communicate in that language?

4.) This study also addresses the role of personality type in picking up a second language. How would you describe your personality type?
   - How would you describe your personality type in your own words?
   - (Show/Discuss score report)
   - Of the four type preferences, which do you feel best describes you? Why?
   - Of the four type preferences, which do you feel least describes you? Why?
   - Of the following words, which describe you the most? Why? (Highlight report)
   - Of the following words, which describe you the least? Why? (Highlight report)
   - Of the following descriptions, which describe you the most? Why? (Highlight report)
-Of the following descriptions, which describe you the least? Why? *(Highlight report)*

5.) How do you think your personality type will either help you or hinder you from “picking up” Spanish?
   -Which aspects of your personality type will be most helpful? Why?
   -Which aspects of your personality type will be the least helpful? Why?

6.) Overall, do you think you will be at an advantage or at a disadvantage for “picking up” Spanish, as compared to other adults who are taking an introductory-level Spanish course?
   -Why?

7.) Is there anything else you want to share with me either about your personality type or about your upcoming experience taking a foreign language class?
APPENDIX H

Interview Guide: Final Interview

Purpose:

The purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological study will be to describe the perceived experience of second language acquisition (SLA) for adult second language (L2) learners in a formal learning environment (FLE) at the Community College of Virginia (CCVA) and to describe how these learners perceive that their personality type either enhances or inhibits their experience of SLA.

Subquestions Addressed:

- How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?
- How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?
- In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their SLA experience at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

Interview Script/Questions:

1.) This will be the second and final interview for this study. It will be audio-recorded for accuracy; is that OK?

2.) Has anything changed in terms of your academic major or your degree pursuit since we last spoke?

3.) Remember that this study is about second language acquisition, or the ability to “pick up” a second language. Now that you are at the end of your first semester of introductory-level Spanish, what does that mean to you?
   - How would you know if someone has “picked up” a language?
   - What would someone who has “picked up” a language be able to do?
   - How well would someone who has “picked up” a language be able to communicate in that language?
   - How do you think your understanding of “picking up” a language has changed since the beginning of your introductory-Spanish course?

4.) Overall, how would you describe your experience in Spanish class this semester?
   - How well do you think you “picked up” the language?
   - Describe a time in which you felt you “picked up” the language.
   - Describe a time in which you felt you had not “picked up” the language.

5.) Remember that this study also addresses the role of personality type in “picking up” a second language. I have your personality type listed as __________ [indicate type according to Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) report]. Has your own interpretation of your personality type changed since we last spoke?
   - How would you describe yourself at this point in time?

6.) How do you think your personality type either helped you or hindered you from “picking up” Spanish?
- Which aspects of your personality type were the most helpful? Why?
- Which aspects of your personality type were the least helpful? Why?

7.) Overall, do you think you were at an advantage or at a disadvantage for “picking up” Spanish, as compared to other adults who were taking an introductory-level Spanish course?
   - Why?

8.) Is there anything else you want to share with me either about your personality type or about your experience taking a foreign language class?
APPENDIX I

Focus Group Prompts

Purpose:
The purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenological study will be to describe the perceived experience of second language acquisition (SLA) for adult second language (L2) learners in a formal learning environment (FLE) at the Community College of Virginia (CCVA) and to describe how these learners perceive that their personality type either enhances or inhibits their experience of SLA.

Subquestions Addressed:

• How do these learners describe the meaning of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?
• How do these learners describe their experience of SLA at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?
• In what ways do these learners perceive that their personality type has either enhanced or inhibited their SLA experience at the end of an introductory-level Spanish course?

Focus Group Script/Prompts:

1.) This focus group will be both audio-recorded and video-recorded for accuracy; is that OK?

2.) One at a time, please give a short description of yourself, including your academic major and your Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) personality type.

3.) Remember that this study is about second language acquisition, or the ability to “pick up” a second language. Discuss what “picking up a language” means, in terms of being able to communicate in the language.
   -To have “picked up” a language, do you have to be able to speak the language? Why?
   -To have “picked up” a language, do you have to be able to understand spoken language? Why?
   -To have “picked up” a language, do you have to be able to write the language? Why?
   -To have “picked up” a language, do you have to be able to read the language? Why?
   -What else determines whether or not someone has “picked up” a language?

4.) Discuss some of your experiences in Spanish class this semester. Overall, how well do you think you “picked up” the language?
   -Describe some experiences in which you felt you “picked up” the language.
   -Describe some experiences in which you felt you had not “picked up” the language.

5.) Discuss the role that you think your personality played in your ability to “pick up” the language.
   -What aspects of your personality made “picking up” the language easier for you? Why?
   -What aspects of your personality made “picking up” the language harder for you? Why?

6.) Is there anything else that you want to share or discuss about your personality type or your experience taking a foreign language class?
### APPENDIX J

#### Data Collection and Analysis Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Interview #1</th>
<th>Interview #2</th>
<th>Journal #1</th>
<th>Journal #2</th>
<th>Journal #3</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl B.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle B.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn B.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah B.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline B.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**

--- Data Collection Needed
0 Data Collection Complete
1 Data Analysis Step #1 (wholistic approach) Complete
2 Data Analysis Step #2 (selective approach) Complete
* Data Analysis Step #3 (detailed approach) Complete; Data Analysis Complete
N/A No data collection/analysis available
## APPENDIX K

### Theme Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SLA is the ability to comprehend and to produce comprehensibly in a variety of formats in the L2.</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>1. SLA can take several forms; based on intent</td>
<td>1. Evelyn FG, lines 55-57&lt;br&gt;1. Evelyn FG, lines 74-76&lt;br&gt;Evelyn FG, lines 84-87&lt;br&gt;Evelyn FG, lines 96-98&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 94-99&lt;br&gt;Danielle FG, lines 144-146&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 205-214&lt;br&gt;Danielle &amp; Jacqueline FG lines 215-219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to verbalize (speak) L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ashley Int. #1, lines 44-49&lt;br&gt;Evelyn FG, lines 47-49&lt;br&gt;Bridgette FG, lines 84-87&lt;br&gt;Carl FG, lines 77-80&lt;br&gt;Evelyn FG, lines 94-98&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 93-96&lt;br&gt;Danielle FG, lines 144-146&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 202-203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to comprehend verbalized (spoken) L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ashley Int. #1, lines 60-62&lt;br&gt;Danielle &amp; Evelyn FG, lines 147&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 178-181&lt;br&gt;Danielle FG, lines 188-189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability to comprehend and produce gestures associated with verbalized (spoken) L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Jacqueline FG, lines 100-102&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 116-118&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 121-123, 125-126&lt;br&gt;Danielle FG, lines 127-128&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 178-181&lt;br&gt;Jacqueline FG, lines 205-209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to write L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Evelyn Int. #2, lines 10-11&lt;br&gt;Evelyn Int. #2, lines 27-28&lt;br&gt;Evelyn FG, lines 55-59&lt;br&gt;Carl FG, lines 77-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ4</td>
<td>6. Ability to read L2</td>
<td>Evelyn FG, lines 94-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SLA refers to a range of function in the L2.</td>
<td>1. Extent of L2 comprehension and production varies</td>
<td>1. Ashley Int. #1, lines 70-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #1, lines 80-82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #1, line 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #1, lines 59-60, 62-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #1, lines 47-49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #1, lines 51-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah Int. #1, lines 41-42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah Int. #1, lines 45-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #1, lines 63-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #1, line 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Int. #2, lines 19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Int. #2, lines 23-26, 38-39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #2, lines 35-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #2, lines 18-20, 22-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #2, lines 33-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #2, lines 11-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #2, lines 19-21, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #2, lines 27-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 29-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 42-46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn FG, lines 44-46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn FG, lines 72-76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl FG, lines 77-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl FG, lines 92-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle FG, lines 72-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline FG, lines 136-143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline FG, lines 178-181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle FG, lines 351-355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to think in L2</td>
<td>2. Evelyn FG, line 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to communicate with L1 speakers</td>
<td>1. Carl Int. #1, lines 78-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #1, lines 92-94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #1, line 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #1, lines 51-53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah Int. #1, lines 41-42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #2, lines 27-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn FG, lines 41-43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Confidence to travel</td>
<td>5. Evelyn Int. #1, lines 51-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Confidence in finding employment</td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #1, lines 63-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #2, lines 19-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 36-41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn FG, line 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The learners were apprehensive about their experience of SLA.</td>
<td>1. Overall lack of confidence in L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Carl Int. #1, lines 78-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #1, lines 416-419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah Int. #1, lines 254-255, 257-258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #1, lines 51-52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Jour. #1, lines 7-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Jour. #1, lines 1-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Jour. #1, lines 6-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Format of FLE | Ashley Jour. #2, line 1  
Danielle Jour. #2, line 1  
Carl Int. #2, line 56  
Evelyn Int. #2, lines 129-132  
Evelyn FG, lines 131-132; 135-136  
Carl FG, line 205  
Jacqueline FG, lines 55-56  
Danielle FG, lines 66-68  
Jacqueline FG, lines 83-84  
Jacqueline FG, lines 241-242 |
| 2. Hannah Int. #1, lines 260-262  
Ashley Jour. #1, lines 3-4  
Evelyn Jour. #1, line 4, 8-9  
Ashley Jour. #2, lines 5-6  
Jacqueline Jour. #3, lines 7-9  
Evelyn Int. #2, lines 120-121, 124-132  
Danielle FG, lines 323-327  
Jacqueline FG, lines 344-345 |
| 3. Vocabulary | Ashley Jour. #1, lines 1-3  
Evelyn Int. #2, lines 41-43 |
| 4. Grammar | Ashley Int. #1, lines 286-288  
Ashley Jour. #1, lines 294-297  
Danielle Jour. #1, lines 1-2  
Ashley Jour. #2, line 3  
Carl Jour. #2, lines 1-4  
Jacqueline Jour. #2, lines 4-6  
Carl Jour. #3, line 2  
Evelyn Jour. #3, lines 2-3  
Ashley Int. #2, lines 42-45  
Carl Int. #2, lines 84-91, 110-111  
Danielle Int. #2, lines 72-74  
Evelyn Int. #2, lines 60-64, 68-73, 75  
Danielle Jour. #2, lines 97-104  
Carl FG, lines 137-141  
Jacqueline FG, lines 305-306  
Jacqueline FG, lines 314-321  
Jacqueline & Danielle FG, lines 337-344  
Jacqueline FG, lines 464-470 |
| 5. Speaking ability | Evelyn Jour. #1, line 4  
Evelyn Jour. #2, lines 1-3, 4-5  
Jacqueline Jour. #2, lines 2-4  
Evelyn Jour. #3, lines 5-7  
Ashley Int. #2, lines 47-48  
Evelyn Int. #2, lines 47-48  
Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 62-63  
Evelyn FG, lines 144-148  
Evelyn FG, lines 158-160  
Evelyn FG, lines 211-215  
Danielle FG, lines 105-108 |
| 6. Listening comprehension-fast speech | Ashley Int. #1, line 301  
Carl Jour. #3, lines 4-7  
Ashley Int. #2, lines 58-62  
Carl Int. #2, lines 61-70  
Carl Int. #2, lines 132-135  
Carl Int. #2, lines 142-145  
Danielle Int. #2, lines 62-64  
Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 16-17  
Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 50-51  
Jacqueline Int. #2, line 62  
Carl FG, lines 317, 319-322  
Carl FG, lines 327-332 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4. Using the L2 outside of the FLE enhanced the learners' experience of SLA.</th>
<th>RQ2</th>
<th>1. (Need to) use L2 outside of FLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ5</td>
<td>2. Carl Jour. #3, lines 6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #2, lines 63-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ashley Int. #1, lines 51-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #1, lines 304-308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #1, lines 320-322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Jour. #2, lines 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Jour. #2, lines 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Int. #2, lines 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Int. #2, lines 50-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #2, lines 64-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #2, lines 37-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #2, lines 54-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 49-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle FG, lines 85-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle FG, lines 168-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Danielle Jour. #2, lines 5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Jour. #2, lines 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Int. #2, lines 70-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Int. #2, lines 83-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #2, lines 48-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #2, lines 55-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 51-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn FG, lines 132-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline FG, lines 56-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline FG, lines 80-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle FG, lines 105-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline FG, lines 162-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline FG, lines 230-234, 240-244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle FG, lines 267-272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle FG, lines 383-384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline FG, lines 438-440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5. It was difficult for the learners to explain the connection between their MBTI personality type and their experience of SLA.</th>
<th>RQ6</th>
<th>1. Did not reflect on connection between SLA and personality type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pauses/hesitant speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Explains using other individual difference variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Carl Int. #2, lines 119-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Int. #2, line 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ashley Int. #1, lines 259-262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #1, line 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hannah Int. #1, line 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #1, lines 310-313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashley Int. #2, lines 83, 90, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #2, lines 119-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Int. #2, lines 159-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 124-125, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 139, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueline FG, line 377, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Evelyn Int. #1, lines 316-318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle Int. #2, lines 94-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danielle FG, line 447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Inaccurate use of MBTI terminology

6. Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with their dominant functions) enhanced the learners’ experience of SLA.

    | RQ6 | RQ6 |
    | 4. Jacqueline Int. #1, lines 316-318, Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 150-161 |

| 1. Ashely Int. #1, lines 267-269, Ashely Int. #2, lines 95, 99-103 |
| 2. Evelyn Int. #1, lines 300-307, Evelyn Int. #1, lines 320-322 |
| 3. Danielle Int. #2, lines 86-89, Danielle Int. #2, line 91, Danielle Int. #2, lines 112-113, Danielle FG, lines 380-387, 389 |
| 4. Carl Int. #1, lines 224-236, Carl Int. #2, lines 280-285 |
| 5. Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 119-122 |

7. Exhibiting specific character traits (that are consistent with the extraversion and perceiving attitudes) enhanced the learners’ experience of SLA.

| 1. Ashley Int. #1, lines 271-275, Hannah Int. #1, lines 217-219, Ashley Int. #2, lines 70-75, Ashley Int. #2, lines 108-110, Evelyn Int. #2, lines 92-93, Evelyn FG, line 241, Evelyn FG, lines 273-275, Danielle FG, lines 415-416 |
| 2. Danielle Int. #1, lines 293-295, Jacqueline Int. #1, lines 300-307, Danielle Int. #2, lines 91-92, Danielle Int. #2, lines 112-113, Danielle Int. #2, lines 116-117, Carl FG, lines 238-240, Danielle FG, lines 380-387, Jacqueline FG, lines 393-394, Jacqueline FG, lines 402-412, Jacqueline FG, lines 435-438 |
| 3. Jacqueline Int. #1, lines 321-324 |
| 4. Ashley Int. #1, line 200, Ashley Int. #1, lines 284-286, Evelyn Int. #1, line 305, Jacqueline Int. #1, lines 309-310, Ashley Int. #2, lines 97-99, Ashley Int. #2, lines 114-117, Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 117-119, Jacqueline Int. #2, lines 165-166, Jacqueline FG, lines 402-412 |

- 1. Contemplative, analytical (T)
- 2. Kind, friendly (F)
- 3. Kind, warm, friendly, kind, personable (F)
- 4. Creative, insightful, big-picture (N)
- 5. Observant, practical, concrete (S)

- 1. (Need to be) sociable; outgoing; initiating; actively involved (E)
- 2. Outgoing; initiating; actively involved; sociable (E)
- 3. (Need to be) open-minded (P)
- 4. Adaptable, open-minded (P)
## APPENDIX L

### Member Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashley A.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>“SLA is the ability to speak a second language and to understand and be understood. My experience with SLA was up and down. I experienced a lot of frustration because it seemed like there was so much to learn. I got confused at times with the stem changing verbs and preterite. I did however, try to understand people whenever I would hear someone speaking Spanish. I would at times try to practice with strangers that I realized spoke Spanish. I tend to be introverted but because I really wanted to pick up this language, I would at times speak to strangers who spoke Spanish so I could practice so this definitely brought out the extrovert in me. I am open-minded and inquisitive so I think these type of preferences enhanced my experience as well.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl B.</td>
<td>“Interview #1, -p9, line 145 around 13:15-13:20 I believe the word is &quot;survey&quot; -p15, line 293 around 28:40-28:45 I don't think I understood what I was saying in that moment -p16, line 319 around 28:50 it was &quot;seized&quot; -p17, line 327 around 32:45-32:50 again, I don't know what I was saying. ... I don't know what I said here, but in the previous line, I'm pretty sure I did not use the word &quot;bought&quot;. I was referring to the bad grade she got (which may have been the actual word) -Interview #2- p.3, line 28- unclear/unsure it is Mission- the International Mission Board is an entity of the Southern Baptist Convention and N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
partners with churches to empower missionary teams

On the focus group, on page 6, I'm pretty sure I said ‘I CAN’ (not can't) write, just that my writing was often illegible.

and as far as feedback is concerned, I think you did pretty well considering you were talking to someone who speaks like a record player with a shaky needle :)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danielle B.</th>
<th>“It all looks good to me thanks for letting me be apart of your project I hope it goes well!!! Good luck!!!”</th>
<th>“Yes I agree with all the information it was very well put together good job”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn B.</td>
<td>“I've tried to fill in the blanks. I think the transcription looks good, 5 for accuracy.</td>
<td>“I am in agreement. Looks like a lot of work!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview #2-p.7, line 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[most important].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Group-p.6, line 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Group-p.17, line 347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{[unclear words]} - for line 347 I don't recall what I said but I don't think it was important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I'm not sure whether it makes a difference to your analysis, but I would like to point out that when I'm nodding while someone is speaking, it's to show I am listening to what they are saying, but does not necessarily indicate agreement. I think this might be a cultural thing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let me know if there is anything else I can do to help.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah B.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline B.</td>
<td>“np, well written”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

Auditor’s Checklist

Auditor’s Checklist
Goal: To ensure that the process of inquiry is logical, traceable, and documented.

- Researcher’s Data Collection and Analysis Checklist
- Preliminary questionnaire (all participants)
- MBTI profiles (all participants)
- Interview guide #1
- Interview transcript #1 (all participants)
- Interview recording #1 (all participants)
- Interview guide #2
- Interview transcript #2 (selected participants)
- Interview recording #2 (selected participants)
- Journal prompt
- Journal entries (selected participants)
- Focus group prompts
- Focus group transcript (selected participants)
- Focus group recording (selected participants)

Notes:
- Consistent format between interviews #1 and #2
- Do you need to look in transcripts when you see the interview?
  Need something up?
- Person-centered - was a confusing concept to more than one interviewee!
- A few format errors (e.g., lack of a space or two spaces) in transcriptions and journal entries (capitalization, etc.)
- Did they all have the same teacher?
-_focus of I spoke less about MBTI
APPENDIX N

Auditor’s Rubric

| Goal #1: To ensure that the process of inquiry is logical, traceable, and documented. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 No data collection materials are present. | 2 Some data collection materials are present. | 3 All data collection materials are present. |

Goal #2: To verify that the transcriptions provide an accurate account of the recorded data.

| Goal #3: Goal: To ensure that the inferences based on the data are logical. |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Interview and focus group transcriptions do not provide an accurate account of the recorded data. | 2 Interview and focus group transcriptions generally provide an accurate account of the recorded data. | 3 Interview and focus group transcriptions provide an accurate account of the recorded data. |
| 2 Memoing and notations on interview transcripts, focus group transcripts, and journal entries do not provide a logical interpretation of the data. | 3 Memoing and notations on interview transcripts, focus group transcripts, and journal entries generally provide a logical interpretation of the data. | 4 Memoing and notations on interview transcripts, focus group transcripts, and journal entries provide a logical interpretation of the data. |
| 3 Categories or themes do not fit the data and do not provide an understanding of the phenomenon under study. | 4 Categories or themes generally fit the data and generally provide an understanding of the phenomenon under study. | 5 Categories or themes fit the data and provide an understanding of the phenomenon under study. |