

COMPARING THE PERFORMANCE OF EXTROVERT AND INTROVERT INTERMEDIATE FEMALE EFL LEARNERS ON LISTENING AND READING TASKS

Behdokht Mall-Amiri

Islamic Azad University of Central Tehran Branch

b_m_amiri@yahoo.com

Nazanin Nakhaie

Islamic Azad University of Central Tehran Branch

Nazanin_200861@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The present study focused on the difference between English as a foreign language (EFL) introvert and extrovert learners regarding their reading and listening abilities. Instruments for this study included Preliminary English Test (PET), Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI), test of listening tasks (6 kinds of listening tasks, 80 items), test of reading tasks (8 kinds of reading tasks, 60 items). The study was conducted on 150 intermediate female EFL learners at Soodeh Language School and Kish Institute who participated and answered a PET test. The 108 homogeneous participants who scored one standard deviation below and above the estimated mean responded to EPI and based on the result of this questionnaire, they were divided into two groups of extroverts and introverts. Then both groups took the same test of listening and reading tasks and their results were compared. Finally, to observe whether or not there were any significant differences between the two groups in terms of performing reading and listening tasks, an independent t-test and a Mann-Whitney U test were run as the assumptions for a MANOVA were violated. The results indicated that introverts perform significantly better in listening tasks than extroverts. But in reading section there was no significant difference between the two groups of students.

KEYWORDS: Personality, Extrovert, Introvert, Task, Listening Comprehension, Reading Comprehension.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years increasing numbers of teachers, in all subjects, have been looking for ways to change the traditional forms of instruction in which knowledge is transmitted. They have sought ways to make the classroom more “student-centered” and have investigated the different ways in which students can play more active roles in discovering and processing knowledge (Littlewood, 2000). In the field of language teaching, the approach which is currently best known in this respect is “task-based language teaching”.

For the past 20 years, task-based language teaching (TBLT) has attracted the attention of second language acquisition (SLA) researchers, curriculum developers, educationalists, teacher trainers and language teachers worldwide. Long (1985) and Prabhu (1987), in their seminal writings, among others, supported an approach to language education in which students are given functional tasks that invite them to focus primarily on meaning exchange and to use language for real-world, non-linguistic purposes.

One of the major goals of EFL instruction is to prepare learners to be able to understand their interlocutors. The importance of listening cannot be underestimated since as Brownell (1995) believes that listening skills are as important as speaking skills. Speaking does not itself constitute communication unless what is said is comprehended by another person. Teaching the comprehension of spoken speech is therefore of primary importance if communication's aim is to be reached. Considering the importance of listening skill, Chastain (1988) maintains that, "to learn to speak, students must first learn to understand the spoken language they hear. The negative effect that undeveloped listening skills have on second language learning is quite profound. To communicate with native speakers, students must first learn to understand enough in real language situations to comprehend the gist of what native speakers are saying" (p. 193).

Another skill that should be considered in learning foreign languages is reading comprehension. Reading is an important skill for most students of English throughout the world, especially in countries where foreign language learners do not have the opportunity to interact with native speakers but have access to the written form of that language (Rivers, 1968). In the past reading was considered as a language learning process in which the teacher used reading materials to teach vocabulary and grammar, but nowadays it is considered as a communicative process in which reading for meaning is the core objective. Reading can be considered as a source of information, as a pleasurable activity, and as a means of extending one's knowledge of the language (Rivers, 1968).

"In the classroom there is a danger that reading or listening takes place in a void, without purpose or challenge. But it is possible to design tasks which will provide a context for written or spoken texts in order to provide the purpose or challenge which is basic to reading or listening in the real world. These tasks are valuable learning activities in themselves and by providing a context they also make the reading or listening into a meaning focused activity" (Willis & Willis, 2008, p. 33). The purposeful nature reading and listening enhance learning.

The concept of language teaching has always been with us at different stages. Some experts like Busch (1982) who writes about second language learning make the point that language is closely bound up with human behavior and personality. Nowadays, with so many people being interested in learning English, the factors that could impact on their learning effectiveness become more important to know. As we all know, many factors influence the second language learning process. Yet one of the most important elements for SLA research to explain is the great individual variability second language learners

obtain in their respective second languages, so it's getting more important to know more about the influence of personality on SLA. Personality factor theory is founded upon the work of Jung (1923). Bradley and Hebert (1997) state that "according to the personality factor theory, individuals are predisposed to one of four preference alternatives in their behavior: (a) How a person is energized - designated by extrovert (E) versus introvert (I); (b) What information a person perceives - designated by sensing (S) versus intuition (N); (c) How a person decides - thinking (T) versus feeling (F); (d) The life-style a person adopts - judging (J) versus perceiving (P)" (pp. 340-341).

In order to provide effective sensitive instruction, teachers of second or foreign languages need to learn to identify and understand their students' significant individual differences (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995b; Ehrman, 1993). Among personality factors, Extroversion and, its counterpart introversion, are also potentially important factors in the learning of a second language.

The researchers believe that in spite of the attempts which have been made in the TBLT area to produce authentic, purposeful, informative, enjoyable and motivating contexts to encourage students to use language (especially in listening and reading skills) students' achievement also depends on their personality type, particularly extroversion and introversion types because these personality types may influence students' motivation, the strategies they choose to learn a language, classroom management and teaching language.

Task-based Language Teaching

The task-based approach to language teaching, according to Foster (1999), has evolved in response to a better understanding of the languages learned. Task-based language teaching (TBLT), according to Richards and Rodgers (2001), refers to an approach based on the use of tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching. It may be considered as a logical development of communicative language teaching, since it draws on some of the following principles of communicative language teaching movement from the 1980s:

- Activities that involve real communication are essential for language learning.
- Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning.
- Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process.

They also suggest that tasks are proposed as useful vehicles for applying these principles. These principles provide a link between outside classroom reality and inside classroom pedagogy. At the interface with outside classroom reality, communication tasks enable the course to be organized around chunks of communication which reflect students' needs, interests and experiences. At the interface with inside classroom pedagogy, they provide an organizing focus for the individual components of language that students have to learn in order to communicate.

Nunan (1991) states that task-based language teaching has the following characteristics:

1. Emphasizing on interaction in the target language.
2. Using authentic texts.
3. Focusing not only on language, but also on the learning process itself.
4. Enhancing learner's own personal experiences.
5. Linking classroom language outside the classroom (p.68).

Tomlinson (1998) states that tasks have been used in foreign language classrooms since the mid-1970s. Since learners need to be able to communicate in English, the best way to develop communicative competence is to use the target language for communication.

Littlewood (2004) argues that there is continuity between task-based language teaching and the broader communicative approach within which it is a development. He further suggests that in a task-based approach "tasks serve not only as major components of the methodology, but also as units around which a course may be organized" (p. 324).

Listening

Lundesteen (1971, cited in Devine, 1978), states that listening is "the process by which spoken language is converted to meaning in mind" (p. 296).

One of the major goals of EFL instruction is to prepare learners to be able to understand their interlocutors. Rivers (1981) states that listening is not separated from speaking. In fulfilling a communication what is being said should be comprehended by another person. Rehearsed production is useless if we are to respond to the reply that it generates from our interlocutors.

Also Chastain (1988) maintains that both language teachers and students tend to overlook the importance of listening comprehension skills. They do so because their attention is fixed so completely on their ultimate goal, speaking, that they fail to recognize the need for developing functional listening comprehension skills as a prerequisite to developing skills.

Reasons of Negligence

As Chastain (1988) maintains, the reasons of neglecting the listening skill can be summarized as:

- 1) The listening comprehension process is internal and thus not subject to direct, external observation, examination, and correction. Therefore, language teachers and students tend to overlook its prerequisite importance in language learning because there is no immediate observable output.
- 2) Many teachers have learned that they should base classroom activities on behavioral objectives, so they expect students to produce a product that they can hear or see.
- 3) They can correct students' errors only if they hear them say something or if they read what they have written.

4) They feel more comfortable conducting activities in which they can control what the students are doing.

5) Tradition also contributes to the slight attention paid to listening in many language classes. Teachers tend to teach as they were taught, and the students tend to expect the same types of classes they have learned to associate with language classes. The result is that neither teachers nor students question the validity of traditional class activities.

6) Since teachers have little experience providing classroom activities that help students develop listening comprehension skills, they may not be prepared to generate and conduct the appropriate activities (p. 192).

Modi (2012) maintained that “while traditional approaches to language teaching tended to underemphasize the importance of teaching listening comprehension, more recent approaches emphasize the role of listening in building up language competence and suggest that more attention should be paid to teaching listening in the initial stage of second or foreign language learning” (p. 57).

Factors Influencing Listening Comprehension

Anderson and Lynch (1988) also identify factors that influence listening comprehension as follows:

Personal Style

A more patient, reflective person takes more time to listen and, consequently, may be perceived as listening more effectively.

Intelligence

Because intelligence, as a listening variable, interacts with number of factors such as personality, motivation, attitude, and interest in the subject.

Anxiety and Stress

High anxiety in listening situations may lead to asking questions that have already been answered or making statements unrelated to current topic of discussion. While the fear of speaking is probably related to social approval, the anxiety one experiences as listener is more likely consequence of his fear of, misinterpreting or misunderstanding of the speaker.

Attitude

Even under the best circumstances one tends to listen selectively. If one dislikes a speaker and anticipates that the speaker will have nothing valuable to say, it is likely that what one hears will confirm his expectations.

Gender

Coleman (1978, cited in Anderson and Lynch, 1988) was among the first to suggest that females perform better on tasks that involve verbal ability, while men perform better when visual skills are involved.

Culture

An individual culture, background, role, and other variables determine listeners' unique perspective.

Message and Speaker

The clarity of the organization has a significant impact on listener's ability to comprehend and recall the information he hears. Speakers who use clear organizational strategies are easier to follow than those who present ideas randomly. A speaker's mannerism and delivery have an impact on credibility and affect the listener's attention, comprehension and retention (pp. 35-38).

Reading

Many foreign or second language teaching authorities like (Richards and Renandya, 2002; Anderson, 2003; Nunan, 2004) believe that reading is the most important language skill. Richards and Renandya (2002) argue that in many second or foreign language teaching situations, reading receives a special focus. He believes that there are a number of reasons for this. First, many language foreign language students often consider reading as one of their most important goals. They want to be able to read for information and pleasure, for their career, and for study purposes. In fact, in most EFL situations, the ability to read in a foreign language is all the learners ever want to acquire. Second, written texts serve various pedagogical purposes. Extensive exposure to linguistically comprehensible written texts can enhance the purpose of language acquisition. Good reading texts also provide good models for writing and provide opportunities to introduce new topics, to stimulate discussion, and to study language. Reading, then, is a skill which is highly valued by students and teachers (p. 273).

Grabe (2001) highlights the importance of reading in academic settings. He states that in academic settings, reading is assumed to be the central means for learning new information and gaining access to alternative explanations and interpretations. Reading also provides the foundation for synthesis and critical evaluation skills. In addition, reading is the primary means for independent learning, whether the goal is performing better on academic tasks, learning more about subject matter, or improving language abilities (cited in Celce-Murcia, 2001).

Rivers (1968) believes that reading is a basic skill through which students at a higher level can learn to read great quantities of authentic material and to read for communication. They can also increase their knowledge and understanding of the culture of the speakers of the language, their people and their ways of thinking, their literature, and their past and present civilization.

Reading Comprehension and Communicative Tasks

Nunan (1993) defines a communicative task as a "piece of classroomwork which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on meaning rather than form" (p. 59). Strictly speaking, in

task activities, the goal is nonlinguistic. The idea is to get something done via the language, to read a text and do something with the information (Long & Crookes, 1992). According to Knutson (1998) whole tasks involve performance of reading in conjunction with other skills: listening, speaking, or writing. For example, students in a small group might read a number of texts, such as brochures, timetables, or maps, and listen to radio weather or traffic reports in order to carry out the larger task of deciding on the best method of transportation to use on a trip. In such an activity, each student deals with one category of information, and all students must communicate their information to one another to come up with the best plan for the trip.

According to Davies (1995) “traditional reading exercises, such as multiple-choice, are extremely limited in their potential as learning activities. Reading tasks can probably be used as an alternative to the traditional approach to reading comprehension because they not only make use of authentic and challenging texts, but also involve the students interacting with the text and with each other. These two features of reading tasks, along with other features, may motivate the reader to engage in the learning process more actively, hence, to learn the language better” (p. 144).

Difference between Introverts and Extroverts

According to Hjelle and Ziegler (1992) most of the efforts have been aimed at determining whether there are significant differences in behavior associated with individual differences along the introversion-extroversion continuum. Some empirically established ways in which introverts and extroverts have been found to differ include:

1. Introverts prefer theoretical and scientific vocations (e.g., engineering and chemistry), whereas extroverts tend to prefer people oriented jobs (e.g., sales and social work).
2. Introverts attain higher grades in college than extroverts. Also, students who withdraw from college for psychiatric reasons tend to be extroverts.
3. Introverts show higher arousal levels in the mornings, whereas extroverts show higher arousal levels in the evening. Furthermore, introverts work better in the morning, and extroverts work better in the afternoon (p. 284).

Introversion-Extroversion and Reading and Listening comprehension

The study of personality factors, in general, and extroversion/introversion, in particular, with regard to second language acquisition has recently begun to attract increasing attention. Several studies have been carried out to investigate if extroversion/introversion personality trait plays any role in the process of language learning. Pazhuhesh (1994) studied the relationship between the personality dimension of extroversion/introversion and reading comprehension. In her studies introverts were significantly better than their extrovert counterparts. Nasrabadi (1996) examined the role of extroversion-introversion personality dimension in EFL listening comprehension in Iran. He found significant results for extroverts. Daneshvari (1996) also examined the role of E/I in EFL listening comprehension in Iran. He concluded that extroverts were better listening strategy users in

comparison with introverts. Brown (1994) “claims that extroversion may be a factor in the development of general oral communicative competence, which require face to face interaction, but not in listening, reading, and writing” (p. 174). But, Tucker, Hamayan and Genesee (1976) found that the more outgoing adventurous students in a one-year late (grade 7) French immersion program performed better on tests of listening comprehension and oral production than did the quieter students. Busch (1982, cited in Brown, 2000) tried to determine whether there would be any relationship between extroversion/introversion and English proficiency among the EFL students in Japan. The study came out to reject the hypothesis that the extraverts are more proficient than the introverts. The study clarified that extroversion had negative correlation with proficiency and the introverts had better reading comprehension and grammar proficiency than the extraverts.

There is no doubt that personality is one of the important factors which impact the second language acquisition, and it is a complicated aspect which is affected by different factors, such as ethnic background, culture, and environment, and so on. Although many researches, as mentioned before, have made a lot of endeavors to study this, it is not surprising that the results of so many experiments are unclear, and that any conclusions can only be viewed as tendencies, not absolutes. More new findings are expected to come up with further development in the personality research area, and to put them into teaching practice of second language in order to the rapid development of second language teaching.

Although the importance of task- based teaching has been accepted by scholars like Skehan (1996); Willis & Willis (2001); Nunan (1991) in the field of language teaching, and despite the research projects (ex: Bangalore Communicational Teaching Project, 1979-1984, by Prabhu, & Ramani-cited in Long and Crookes-1992) done on the influence of task-based instruction on reading and listening skills, to the best knowledge of the present researcher, no important and substantial research has been conducted on studying the relationship between personality types (Extroversion/Introversion) and performing listening and reading tasks at least in Iran. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to compare the performance of Extrovert and Introvert Intermediate Female EFL learners on listening and reading tasks. To fulfill the purpose of the present study which was to see whether there were any significant differences between the performance of Extrovert and Introvert Intermediate Female EFL learners on listening and reading tasks, the following questions were raised:

1. Is there any significant difference between the performance of Extrovert and Introvert Intermediate Female EFL learners on listening tasks?
2. Is there any significant difference between the performance of Extrovert and Introvert Intermediate Female EFL learners on reading tasks?

METHODOLOGY

In order to find appropriate answers to the posed questions, the researchers followed certain procedures and made use of certain instruments, which are reported in this section.

Participants

One hundred and eighty female EFL learners participated in this study, 30 of them who attended the pilot study were intermediate EFL learners at an English institute. And 150 intermediate learners who studied English at a language school and an institute took part in the main study. There was no random selection, and the researcher was not free in selecting the classes and instructional materials. Their age range varied between 13- 24.

Instrumentation

To meet the purpose of the study, the researchers used following instruments:

Preliminary English Test (PET): This test is designed by Cambridge ESOL and is used as a proficiency test for selecting the intermediate sample among the whole participants. PET consists of three main sections: a 35-item reading comprehension test and an 8-item writing test in the first part (1 hour and 30 minutes), a 25-item listening comprehension test in the second part (35 minutes) and a speaking test consisting of four sections in the third part (10-12 minutes).

Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI): EPI is a self-report personality inventory based on Eysenck's (1947-1952) factor analysis of personality which assumes three basic factors (the two most important being extroversion/introversion and neuroticism). The original version of this test contains 57 yes/no questions based on which the degree of extroversion and introversion becomes clarified, but only 24 of them related to measuring the degree of extroversion and introversion. So in this study the Farsi translation of EPI test which contained 24 yes/no questions was administered. The translated version of EPI has been proved to be highly reliable at 0.8 level of significance and published in some books. But the English version of it was translated again to Farsi by a professional translator and compared to Farsi translation of EPI which was already translated and published. They were identical.

Test of Listening Tasks: This test was constructed by the researchers and consisted of 84 items which decreased to 80 items after piloting and doing item analysis. The test consisted of 6 kinds of listening tasks as follows:

Listening Cloze Tasks, Information Transfer Tasks, Communicative Stimulus-Response Tasks, True/ False Listening Tasks, Matching Tasks, Multiple Choices listening Comprehension Tasks.

Test of Reading Tasks: This test was constructed by the researchers and consisted of 63 items which decreased to 60 items after piloting and doing item analysis. The test consisted of 8 kinds of reading tasks as follows:

Matching Tasks, Gap-Filling Tasks, True/False Reading Tasks, Multiple Choice Guessing Meaning Tasks, Paraphrase Recognition Tasks, Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension Tasks, Ordering Tasks, Multiple Choice Cloze Vocabulary/Grammar Tasks.

Procedure

Initially, PET, Listening Tasks and Reading Tasks were piloted. Then PET was administered to the 150 subjects in order to come up with a group of EFL learners at approximately the same level of language proficiency but because of practicality issues and time limitation only listening and reading comprehension parts of the PET was administered in this study. Then, those whose score fell in one standard deviation above and below the mean of the sample were selected. The outcome was a homogenized group of 108 learners.

To determine the personality type of the subjects in terms of Extroversion/Introversion, the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) was administered on 108 learners. Through this questionnaire the learners were divided into two groups of extroverts (63 learners) and introverts (45 learners). In order to have equal number of participants in each group, the researcher randomly selected 45 of the extroverts to be in the Extrovert group and excluded the rest.

After determining the groups of introvert and extrovert, the test of reading tasks was administered. The test contained 60 items in three parts which was administered in three sessions because of the limited time that the institute and school allocated for administering the tests. Subjects took one part of the test in each session in 30 minutes.

After the test of reading tasks, the researcher administered the test of listening tasks. The test contained 80 items and was administered in 3 sessions. It took 30 minutes in each session to administer the parts of the test. The participants listened to each part twice and filled out the answer sheet simultaneously.

After administering the tests and gathering the data, the Descriptive Statistics were estimated then a Mann Whitney U test was run to compare the mean score of introverts and extroverts on listening tasks and an independent t-test was run to compare the mean score of introverts and extroverts on reading tasks.

RESULTS

This study was aimed to compare the performance of introvert/extrovert EFL learners on tasks of listening and reading. The design of this study is “A Criterion group design” which is a subset of Ex post facto design. In this study the personality type (Introversion and Extroversion) was the independent variable, the performance of students on listening and reading tasks were dependent variables and the level of language proficiency (intermediate level) and gender (female) were control variables.

The Homogeneity test

A mock Preliminary English Test (PET) was used as a proficiency test for selecting the intermediate sample among the whole participants. Because the focus of this study was on the listening and reading skills; therefore just the parts of listening comprehension and reading comprehension of PET were used in this research. In order to check the reliability of the test, first of all PET was piloted among 30 intermediate EFL learners of an Institute. After analyzing item facility, item discrimination, choice distribution, and reliability (calculated through the KR-21 formula), PET was recognized suitable for being used in the study (table 1).

Table 1: Results of the PET in the pilot study

N	No. of items	Mean	Range	Variance	SD	r
30	60	35.43	45	225.84	15.02	0.95

As it is shown in the above table the reliability coefficient turned out to be 0.95 which assured the researcher that it could be used safely for the purpose of screening the main participants.

Therefore, this test was administered to a group of 150 intermediate EFL learners of a Language School and an Institute to homogenize subjects of the study. Based on the PET, those participants whose score fell in one standard deviation above and below the mean of the sample through the test were selected for the research. Therefore, 108 of the learners were selected to take part in the study. The results are presented below (table 2).

Table 2: Results of the Homogeneity Test

N	No. of items	Mean	Range	Variance	SD
150	60	41.40	44	125.10	11.18

In another step of the piloting, the test of listening tasks was administered. It took one session (1 hour and 45 minutes). And in the next session Reading Tasks were administered in one session (1 hour and 45 minutes). After piloting the Reading and Listening Tasks, Item analysis, Reliability (calculated through the KR-21 formula) and Internal Consistency of the tests were checked. According to the piloting results, Listening Tasks decreased from 84 items to 80 items and Reading Tasks decreased from 63 items to 60 items (tables 3 and 4).

Table 3: Results of the test of listening tasks in the pilot study

N	No. of items	Mean	Range	Variance	SD	r
30	84	50.26	64	450.82	21.23	0.9667

Table 4: Results of the test of reading tasks in the pilot study

N	No. of items	Mean	Range	Variance	SD	r
30	63	38.33	39	226.29	15.04	0.94

In the last step of the piloting, in order to check the effect of discarding items on the reliability of the tests, the reliability and descriptive statistics of the test of listening tasks with 80 items and

test of reading tasks with 60 items were analyzed, checked and estimated again. Results showed a very good degree of reliability. So, the tasks were recognized suitable for using in the study (tables 5 and 6).

Table 5: Results of the test of listening tasks in the pilot study

N	No. of items	Mean	Range	Variance	SD	r
30	80	46.8	64	441.06	21	0.9680

Table 6: Results of the test of reading tasks in the pilot study

N	No. of items	Mean	Range	Variance	SD	r
30	60	36	40	226	15.03	0.95

The Descriptive Statistics: Test of Reading and Listening Tasks

After determining the groups of introvert and extrovert through the administration of EPI, the test of reading and listening tasks were administered. Both groups of introverts and extroverts took the same tests. The test of reading tasks comprising 60 items in three parts was administered in three sessions and the test of listening tasks consisting of 80 items was administered in three sessions too. The descriptive statistics (mean, range, variance, standard deviation and also reliability) of the tests of reading and listening tasks were calculated. Reliability of the tests was calculated through the KR-21 formula. The results are shown in tables (7 and 8).

Table 7: Results of the test of reading tasks for extroverts and introverts

	N	No. of items	Mean	Range	Variance	SD	Reliability (r)
Extroverts	45	60	41.15	37	64.90	8.05	0.81
Introverts	45	60	43.8	34	108.34	10.40	0.90

Table 8: Results of the test of listening tasks for extroverts and introverts

	N	No. of items	Mean	Range	Variance	SD	Reliability (r)
Extroverts	45	80	51.84	53	169.63	13.02	0.90
Introverts	45	80	57.22	52	209.99	14.49	0.93

The Inferential Statistics: Test of Reading and Listening Tasks

To examine whether the null hypotheses were supported or rejected, the data gathered in this study was subjected to Multivariate-ANOVA (MANOVA), since there were two dependent variables (reading and listening) and one independent variable (personality trait). But, firstly the assumptions of the test should be met: 1. Normality of the distribution of each set of scores, 2. Homogeneity of variances.

The following table (table 9) shows the descriptive statistics including skewness ratios used by the researcher to check the first assumption.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics of the scores obtained by the two groups on listening and reading tasks

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Skewness Ratios
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	
extroverts' reading	45	21.00	58.00	41.1556	8.05649	-.301	.354	0.85
Introverts' reading	45	25.00	59.00	43.8000	10.40891	-.350	.354	0.98
extroverts' listening	45	25.00	78.00	51.8444	13.02437	-.087	.354	0.24
Introverts' listening	45	24.00	76.00	57.2222	14.49120	-1.000	.354	2.82
Valid N (listwise)	45							

As shown in table 9 above, the last column, the skewness ratio belonging to the Introverts' listening scores exceeds the normality range of ± 1.96 , while the rest fall within the range. Therefore, as the first assumption was not met, running a MANOVA was not legitimate, and since there is no non-parametric equivalent for MANOVA, independent t-tests had to be run.

First, to see if there was any significant difference between the reading scores of introverts and extroverts, a t-test was run. The normality of the distribution as one assumption for a t-test is met, as shown in table 9. As table 9 indicates, the introverts outperformed the extroverts in the reading test (43.80 vs. 41.15). But, a further statistical analysis was needed to show whether the difference is significant or not. The following table (table 10) shows the result of the t-test:

Table 10: Independent Samples t-test on the mean scores of reading tasks

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
Reading	Equal variances assumed	3.506	.064	-1.348	88	.181	-2.64444	1.96216	-6.54382	1.25493
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.348	82.795	.181	-2.64444	1.96216	-6.54724	1.25835

With the equal variances assumed as the second condition for t-test ($F=3.50$, $p=.06>.05$), the t-test result is interpreted as there was no significant difference between the two groups regarding their reading skill ($t=1.34$, $p=.181>.05$). So the null hypothesis stating that *there is no difference between the performance of extrovert and introvert female EFL learners on reading tasks* is maintained.

To see the difference between the listening skill of the two groups another t-test is needed, but as one set of scores belonging to the introverts was not normally distributed, the first assumption of t-test was violated. Therefore, the non-parametric equivalent test, Mann-Whitney U test, was run. The following tables (tables 11 and 12) show the result:

Table 11: Ranks of the two groups on the listening task

grouping	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Listening extroverts	45	39.59	1781.50
introverts	45	51.41	2313.50
Total	90		

As table 11 displays, the introverts obtained a higher mean rank (51.41) compared with the extroverts (39.59). The following table (table 12) indicates the significance of the difference:

Table 12: Test Statistics^a of the listening scores

	listening
Mann-Whitney U	746.500
Wilcoxon W	1781.500
Z	-2.148
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.032

a. Grouping Variable: personality trait

As table 12 depicts, the difference between the two groups turned out to be significant ($M=746.5$, $p=.032<.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that *there is no significant difference between the performance of extrovert and introvert female EFL learners on listening tasks* is rejected, with the conclusion that introverts performed significantly better in listening tasks than extroverts.

CONCLUSION

In this study it was demonstrated that the introvert EFL learners were significantly better at listening tasks than the extrovert ones. One possible explanation for such a finding is that according to the personality characteristics of introvert learners, they tend to be better performers in receptive skills like listening, reading, and structure, since according to Eysenck (1965) “they generally have a reflective and thoughtful personality type that suits the receptive kinds of tasks” (p. 59-60). Another reason according to Eysenck (1965) is that “the typical extrovert does not like studying by himself and is generally impulsive individual” (p. 59-60). Also Burrus and Kaenzig (1999) claim that introverts prefer to work on their own than in groups, they do not like being in the center of attention and need time and space to complete the tasks. They need to know what they are expected to do and have suitable condition to concentrate. On the other hand extroverts require high stimulation, cooperating with others and movement to learn and do the tasks. They also like open discussions and discovery activities. Therefore based on the above mentioned findings we can conclude that the special characteristics of introverts: like high concentration and their eagerness to listen rather than to speak and also the kind of listening tasks and the context in which the listening tasks were administered could help them to perform better than extroverts in doing listening tasks.

As for the second hypothesis the researcher was interested to know if extrovert and introvert students were different with regard to their performance on reading tasks. It was shown that the introvert learners with the mean score of (43.80) perform fairly better as compared with extrovert learners with the mean score of (41.15). However the difference between their performances was not statistically significant. One of the justifications that we can come up with might be that introverts have been known as studious and hard-working students compared to more extroverted and outgoing ones. It gives the impression that they are more attentive and conscientious in certain receptive tasks like reading. Therefore, this attentive personality type may contribute to their performance on the types of tasks which need concentration. More over as reflected in table 10, there is a trend in the difference between extroversion-introversion when it comes to reading tasks that is in general, both extroverts and introverts had almost the same performance on the reading tasks part.

This finding is also in line with the finding achieved by Astika, Carrol, and Moneta (1996) which indicates no significant relationship between extroversion-introversion and reading section of the English language proficiency test and there was just a negative trend between extroversion and learners' performance on the reading section. Also Vehar (1968) found no such significant difference in reading test performance between extroverts and introverts. Brown (1994) “claims that extroversion may be a factor in the development of general oral communicative competence, which require face to face interaction, but not in listening, reading, and writing” (p. 174).

The reason for lower performance of extroverts has been explained more in the works of following scholars:

Ellis (1994) presents two major hypotheses concerning the relationship between extroversion/introversion and L2 learning. The first is that extroverted learners will do better in acquiring basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS). Extroverts are more eager to talk, to join the groups and participate in classroom activities. They will use the language more in and outside the classroom. The second hypothesis is that introverted learners will do better at developing cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP). Entwistle and Wilson (1977) claim that introverts will achieve more because they have better long-term memory than extroverts. Besides, they take learning a language in a more serious way and spend more time on reading and writing due to their personality trait. The extroverts are not able to concentrate for a long time and are too sociable to learn with the same attention (Eysenck, 1957).

Based on the above mentioned factors, one possibility for the findings of this study might be due to the kind of tasks used in this study. The tasks used in reading and listening tests did not have interpersonal communication characteristics. Therefore, based on the personality characteristics of extroversion and introversion which was mentioned before, extroverts could not show their ability better than introverts in performing reading and listening tasks.

Therefore, by studying the difference between extroverts and introverts and their probable effect on language skills like reading and listening comprehension, teachers can predict what kinds of activities and tasks students will enjoy, what sort of teaching methods they require and what their learning styles are. Therefore it can be concluded that using tasks for teaching listening and reading comprehension to introvert students is a useful approach but it does not mean that using these tasks for instructing listening and reading comprehension to extroverts is not useful. Thus, it is felt that this study has made some important contributions towards a better understanding of the extroversion-introversion personality variable and its relationship to some learning outcomes (i.e., performance on reading and listening tasks).

LIMITATIONS

Like many other studies, the present study suffered from some limitations.

1. Due to the regulation of language schools and English institutes, the researcher was not able to deal with male students. The subjects who participated in this study were all female students. Therefore, the findings of this study may not be generalizable to male learners.
2. The probable effect of some other variables related to learners such as previous learning backgrounds and age, which might have affected their performance in reading and listening tasks, could not be controlled.
3. Because of shortage of time, the number of task-types which were chosen to apply was limited. And the researcher was not free to use a variety of tasks in tests.
4. Since the researcher was not allowed to select the participants or even classes, there was no random selection.
5. Since the selection of subjects was according to their level of language proficiency, there was not control over the age of the subjects.

6. The subjects participating in this study were selected from intermediate learners, because the researcher only had access to the intermediate level. So, only female EFL learners at intermediate level in a Language School and a Language Institute in Tehran were selected for this study; therefore, the findings are limited to them and might not be generalized to other levels.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A., & Lynch, T. (1988). *Listening*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Astika, G., Carrell, P., & Moneta, P. (1996). Personality types and language learning in an EFL context. *Language Learning*, 46 (1), 75-99.
- Bradley, J., & Hebert, F. (1997). The effect of personality type on team performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 16(5), 337-353.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd.ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Princeton Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (4th.ed). White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Brownell, J. (1995). *Listening attitude; principles and skills*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Burruss, J. D., & Kaenzig, L. (1999). Introversion: the often forgotten factor impacting the gifted. *Virginia Association for the Gifted Newsletter*, 21(1). Retrieved February 19, 2013, from <http://www.sengifted.org/archives/articles/introversion-the-often-forgotton-factor-impacting-the-gifted.shtml>
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion and extroversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*, 32, 32-109.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second-language skills: Theory and practice*. Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Inc.
- Daneshvari, R. (1996). *Extroversion / introversion and listening comprehension*. Master's thesis, Tehran University, Iran.
- Davies, F. (1995). *Introducing reading*. Longman: Penguin English.
- Devine, T. (1978). Listening: what do we know after fifty years of research & theorizing?. *Journal Reading*, 34, 170-189.
- Ehrman, M. (1993). Ego boundaries revisited: Toward a model of personality and learning. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Strategic interaction and language acquisition: theory, practice, and research* (pp.331-362). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1995b). *Cognition plus: Correlates of language proficiency*. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 67-89.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Entwistle, N. J., & Wilson, J. D. (1977). *Degrees of excellence: The academic achievement game*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1957). *Dynamics of anxiety and hysteria*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1965). *Facts and fiction in psychology*. London: Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Foster, P. (1999). Task-based learning and pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, 53(1), 69-70.

- Grabe, W. (2001). Reading- writing relations. Theoretical perspectives and instructional practices. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Ohio State conference on second language reading/writing connections* (pp. 15-47). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hjelle, A., & Ziegler, J. K. (1992). *Personality theories*. (3rd.ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Knutson, E. M. (1998). Reading with a purpose: Communicative reading tasks for the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(1), 49-57.
- Littlewood, W. (2000). "Task-based learning of grammar", a HK ENGLISH ADVISORY INSPECTORATE (Eds.): *Teaching and Learning Update*, 1, 40-57.
- Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319-329.
- Long, M. H. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: task-based language teaching. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition* (pp. 77-99). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Long, M. H., & Crooks, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27-56.
- Mirhassani, A., & Toosi, A. (1996). The impact of word information on reading comprehension. *Roshd FLTJ*, 12(44), 59-66.
- Modi, V. (2012). Recent trends in English language teaching. *Quest International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 1(1), 52-58.
- Nasrabadi, R., D. (1996). *Extroversion/introversion & EFL listening comprehension*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tehran, Iran.
- Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 279-95.
- Nunan, D. (1993). Task-based syllabus design: Selecting, grading, and sequencing tasks. In G. Crookes, & S. Gass, Eds., *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pazhuhesh, P. (1994). *The role of extroversion/ introversion in EFL reading comprehension*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tehran, Iran.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd.ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. (1968). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38-62.
- Tomlinson, B. (1998). Review of the book a framework for task-based learning. *ELT Journal*, 52(3), 257-259.
- Tucker, G. R., Hamayan, E., & Genesee, F. (1976). Affective, cognitive, and social factors in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32, 214-226.
- Vehar, M. A. (1968). Extraversion, introversion and reading ability. *The Reading Teacher*, 21, 357-360.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2008). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2001). Task-based language learning. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Authors

Behdokht Mall-Amiri is Assistant Professor of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran. She has published several articles in domestic and foreign academic journals. She is specifically interested in research areas related to translation, cognitive and learning styles, motivation, and program evaluation.

Nazanin Nakhaie holds an MA degree in TEFL from Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch. She has been teaching English in different language schools, ex: Kalam & Gooyesh and Soodeh in Tehran for the last six years.