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ABSTRACT
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This study was designed to investigate the relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency in second language learning. The subjects who participated in the study were students from the Preparatory School of Erciyes University (PSEU).

At the outset, a group of 87 students were administered a Turkish version of the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) in order to assign them to two groups as either introverts or extroverts. Then, 28 students (14 introverts, 14 extroverts) who were the most introverted and extroverted subjects as determined by their scores on the MPI were selected from the larger pool of students (n=87) for oral interviews in order to gather the data regarding their oral proficiency levels. The oral interviews were taped and then rated on six-point scales by two judges in terms of overall oral proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary.
The subjects’ scores on the MPI and the judges’ scores for each subject were used for the statistical analyses. At first, Pearson product-moment correlation analyses were used in order to investigate relationships between the variables mentioned above. Then, t-test analyses were applied for determining whether there were significant differences between introverted and extroverted subject groups in terms of their mean scores on overall proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary.

The results did not indicate any significant correlations between introversion-extroversion and the components of oral proficiency. However, the correlation between introversion and pronunciation ($p=.105$) was the closest to significance, suggesting a positive but weak relationship. The result of a t-test analysis which revealed that the introverted group was significantly better than the extroverted group in pronunciation also lent some support to the possibility of a relationship between introversion and pronunciation. Thus, this finding may suggest a positive relationship between being introverted and better pronunciation, although it may be slight.

In this study further analyses were also carried out to investigate the relationship between introversion-extroversion and “general achievement” and “speaking proficiency” as assessed by the results of a general battery of tests students take at PSEU. For these analyses the larger group of students ($n=87$), including the smaller group ($n=28$) who had participated in oral interviews, were used as subjects. The same analyses were also carried out separately with the smaller group. Measures of general achievement were obtained from an average of scores received by students on reading, writing, listening,
speaking, and grammar tests administered at PSEU throughout the two semesters. The speaking proficiency measures, on the other hand, were obtained from students’ average scores on speaking tests.

The results of Pearson correlations showed a positive but non-significant relationship (p=.149) between introversion and general achievement with the larger group. However, when the same analyses were carried out with the smaller group, a significant relationship between introversion and general achievement was found at p=.039 level. This finding suggested that there might be a relationship between higher levels of introversion and general achievement since the subjects in the smaller group were the most introverted and extroverted students. As regards the relationship between introversion-extroversion and speaking proficiency, the results of statistical analyses carried out for both sample groups did not reveal significant correlations. In sum, neither overall oral interview scores, nor PSEU speaking test scores seemed to correlate significantly with introversion-extroversion.

The results of the study suggest, along with related studies on the relationship of personality variables to second language performance, that such relationships are more complex than commonly assumed. There may be a need for more in-depth research designs to tease out the possible effects of several cognitive and affective variables on such relationships.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Predicting and understanding achievement in second language learning only in terms of cognitive factors may be insufficient. Affective factors are important as well. The cognitive domain of second language acquisition refers to general learning processes and individual variations in learning, namely, styles and strategies. The affective domain, on the other hand, refers to emotions, feelings, and personality factors that learners bring with them into the language classroom (Brown, 1973).

The impact of the personality dimension of second language learning has received less attention than other factors. The emphasis has been mostly on the cognitive factors. However, in recent years, with the introduction of a more humanistic approach to second language learning, greater emphasis has been laid on personality variables and their relation to the second language learning process. Some of the studies in this field focused on the relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and second language proficiency. In this study the focus is on introversion-extroversion and its relation to oral proficiency in second language learning.

The dichotomy of introversion-extroversion represents one of the several dimensions of an individual’s personality (Eysenck, 1975; Cattell, 1979). Basically, introverts are people whose interests are more in their inner world than in their environment and other people. They have a tendency to withdraw from social interaction and be preoccupied with their thoughts and feelings. They are passive, reserved, and
prefer reading to meeting people. Conversely, extroverts are people who are interested in their environments and other people rather than in themselves. They are sociable, outgoing, active, and have many friends. They are adventuresome, need excitement, and they take risks (Eysenck, 1975). According to Brown (1991) “extroversion is the need (and ability) to receive ego gratification and a sense of wholeness from other people. Introversion is the need and ability to derive this sense of self-esteem from within oneself” (p. 82).

Many people believe that extroversion may clearly affect a learner’s classroom behavior and language-learning outcomes. Qualities such as outgoingness, talkativeness, self-assertion, and the like are what most teachers desire students to possess. It is commonly held that because extroverts are talkative and uninhibited, they are likely to participate in class activities and seek opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to practice the language that they are learning. As a result of their constant efforts to practice in the target language, extroverts are regarded as the right type of people to match the requirements of most language courses which emphasize communicative aspects of second language learning. On the other hand “quiet, reserved personalities are treated as a ‘problem’ and language teachers seek ways of encouraging extroversion” (Brown, 1973, p. 236).

The common belief that extroverts are better learners than introverts has received some support from studies which aimed to characterize “good language learners” (Naiman et al., 1978; Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975). Qualities associated with extroversion
such as, outgoingness, talkativeness, willingness to communicate, and risk-taking have been mentioned as factors which might predict success in second language learning, especially in terms of developing communicative skills (Krashen, 1981; Seliger, 1977).

Although classroom observation, intuition, and some studies conducted in this field lend support to the common assumption that extroverts achieve higher language proficiency than introverts, in many cases the results of empirical research seem to be inconclusive and contradictory, probably because of several educational, cultural, and psychological variables (Strong, 1983). Therefore, more research is needed and these variables should be taken into consideration before attempting to draw conclusions and generalizations regarding the relationship of introversion-extroversion to oral proficiency in second language learning.

Background of the Study

Introversion-extroversion is a factor which may play a significant role in students' classroom behaviors in terms of interaction with teachers and peers. Because extroverts are more sociable, active, and talkative, they are more likely to take advantage of opportunities to improve their communication skills. On the other hand, because introverts are more passive, silent, and withdrawn, they generally prefer to remain in the background and do not show willingness to join in communicative activities (Rubin, 1975). Thus, extroverts seem to possess the appropriate characteristics for better oral
production. However, this may not always be the case, at times introverts may be as proficient as extroverts in speaking skills.

As the researcher was working as an instructor at the Preparatory School of Erciyes University (PSEU) in Kayseri, he realized that some students who tended to be introverted performed quite well in oral examinations. Although these students usually remained silent in class and did not seem to have many practice opportunities, they sometimes outperformed their more extroverted classmates in oral interviews, especially in pronunciation. This led the researcher to believe that extroverted behaviors might not always be good predictors of oral proficiency. Although extroverts were more active in class, perhaps, they were unable to focus on particular sounds and speech processes which were perceived with greater ease by introverts.

Although this was not an in-depth observation, it provided the researcher with a motive to investigate the question of whether being introverted or extroverted makes a difference in the learning of a second language. The idea that one of the reasons for encountering problems in second language teaching could be due to ignorance or stereotyping of personality types has led the researcher to investigate this topic, with a particular focus on introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency. It is believed that language teachers and others involved in language teaching should have an understanding of the issues related to personality factors and their possible effects on language teaching.
Statement of the Problem

As stated earlier, despite the growing recognition of the importance of considering students' personality traits in the second language learning process, the present state of knowledge in this field is still limited and unsatisfactory (Strong, 1983). For example, not much is known about the relationship between introversion-extroversion and second language proficiency, and if a relationship exists, how being introverted or extroverted may influence one's success in learning a second language.

It is argued that behavioral characteristics of introverts and extroverts may be reflected in their development and performance of oral skills. Despite the fact that certain personality traits may enhance or hinder a student's oral proficiency, the need for taking these into consideration is generally ignored in Turkey. Some language teachers fail to notice that introverted and extroverted tendencies may help or hinder learners in coping with the affective requirements of language learning and that it is not exclusively a matter of aptitude or intelligence that leads students to success. In general, teachers are also inclined to stereotype students as good and bad language learners on the basis of perceived introversion-extroversion tendencies of their students. While extroversion is usually held up as an appropriate personality type for second language learning, introversion is often underestimated and discouraged in the classroom. Such preconceived notions about language learners might be misleading. It is possible that both introverts and extroverts have positive and negative features that teachers need to take into consideration while designing instruction that meets the individual needs of both
learner types. In order for teachers and other language teaching specialists to become aware of the role of introversion-extroversion in second language learning, the gap in the literature needs to be filled by further research. The present study aims to contribute to the literature by investigating the relationship between introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency of learners of English at the Preparatory School of Erciyes University (PSEU) in Kayseri, Turkey.

Purpose of the Study

In recent years there have been several studies on introversion-extroversion with respect to oral proficiency in second language learning. Although it is a commonly held belief among teachers and researchers that there is a positive relationship between extroversion and oral proficiency, the extent and significance of this relationship has not yet been clearly demonstrated. Past research studies need to be expanded and replicated by further studies in order to provide insights into this field. As recent studies suggest, the relationship between introversion-extroversion and learning behaviors can be said to exhibit different characteristics in different cultural and social settings.

Furthermore, there seems to be a possibility of obtaining different results in the two different contexts of language learning, namely: in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Although several hypotheses have been proposed about the relationship of introversion-extroversion to second language learning, very few studies have been carried out to investigate this question in
an EFL setting (Busch, 1982). Studies conducted in an EFL context might produce different correlations than those in an ESL context. Therefore, the results of existing studies, most of which have been carried out in ESL contexts, may not be readily applicable to EFL contexts. It would be worthwhile to see what the situation is in an EFL context in Turkey. It is hoped that the findings will contribute to the understanding of this relationship in this setting.

Significance of the study

This study attempts to fill a gap in the literature on how personality traits of introversion-extroversion may affect second language learning in terms of oral proficiency. The awareness of such a relationship may be helpful in providing teachers, program designers, researchers, and department coordinators with insights into how oral skills of students can be developed in an effective way. For example, if it is made clear that extroverted learners are more successful than introverted learners in oral skills (or vice versa) it may be possible to make some necessary arrangements in a speaking course in order to meet the individual needs of students who may be at a disadvantage due to their personality. Although one’s personality cannot be changed, the awareness of individual personality differences and their impact on the second language learning process may be helpful in maintaining the appropriate learning conditions both for successful and unsuccessful learners in some particular skill area. The findings of the study are intended to attract the attention of those who are involved in foreign language
teaching, and stimulate their interest in handling potential problems related to this dimension of personality.

Research Questions

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and overall oral proficiency?
2. Is there a relationship between introversion-extroversion and pronunciation?
3. Is there a relationship between introversion-extroversion and fluency?
4. Is there a relationship between introversion-extroversion and grammatical accuracy?
5. Is there a relationship between introversion-extroversion and knowledge of vocabulary?

This introductory chapter presented the background and the goals of the study. Chapter 2 contains a review of related literature.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Recent research studies have revealed that success in second language learning is dependent not only on cognitive factors, but also on affective factors. Related to the affective dimension of language learning are a number of personality characteristics which are proposed as likely to have an effect on second language learning.

Previous research studies regarding the role of personality factors in language learning have shown that certain personality traits may be considered to be helpful or detrimental to successful language learning. Although these studies do not show precisely how personality traits and language learning relate, they do demonstrate the existence of the relationship.

Personality traits of introversion-extroversion are also potentially important factors in the acquisition of a second language. Many people intuitively believe that an outgoing, sociable person learns a second language faster and better than a reserved, shy person. This view receives some support from classroom observation and forms the basis of an appealing hypothesis. It seems reasonable to many people that a learner with an outgoing personality may be involved in more interaction with the teacher, seek more opportunities to practice in the target language, and be more self-confident in communicative situations which, in turn, will positively affect his or her second language performance, especially with respect to oral skills.
However, due to a paucity of research and the inconclusive results of existing studies, it is difficult to define the possible relationship between introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency in second language learning. It is, thus, the purpose of this study to investigate whether such a relationship exists between introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency in second language learning.

This chapter presents a review of literature on the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and their relation to general academic achievement, and second language learning specifically with respect to oral proficiency.

**Introversion-Extroversion**

The personality traits of introversion-extroversion were first introduced to psychology by the Swiss psychiatrist C. G. Jung and were later measured by Eysenck (1970). The introversion-extroversion dichotomy is one of the several dimensions or traits (descriptions of habitual behavior patterns) of personality which along with others makes up an individual’s overall personality.

According to Jung (1971), the basic difference between introversion-extroversion lies in a person’s tendencies for attending to the inner world of subjectivity with an emphasis on reflective, introspective cognitive activity, which bring about introverted behavior, versus tendencies for attending to the outer world of objective events with an emphasis on active involvement in the environment, which bring about extroverted
behavior. Jung views introversion-extroversion basically as an interaction between the individual and the environment.

Eysenck (1967), on the other hand, adopts a more biological and behavioral approach in contrast to Jung's theory. He contends that the differing arousal levels of introverts and extroverts caused by the activating system of the brain result in different attitudinal preferences and tendencies. The resulting behavioral differences are most apparent with the presence of other persons and social situations. While social activities are typically arousing and, as a result, more likely to be sought and enjoyed by extroverts, introverts learn social inhibitions which are manifested in their behaviors in social settings (1970). Eysenck provides a description of introverts and extroverts as follows:

The typical extrovert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to and does not like reading or studying by himself. He craves excitement, takes chances, often sticks his neck out, acts on the spur of the moment, and is generally an impulsive individual. He is fond of practical jokes, always has a ready answer, and generally likes change; he is carefree, easygoing, and optimistic. He prefers to keep moving and doing things, tends to be aggressive and loses his temper quickly; altogether his feelings are not kept under tight control, and he is not always a reliable person.

The typical introvert is a quiet, retiring sort of person, introspective, fond of books rather than people; he is reserved and distant except to
intimate friends. He tends to plan ahead, and distrusts the impulse of the moment. He does not like excitement, takes matters of everyday life with proper seriousness, and likes a well-ordered mode of life. He keeps his feelings under close control, seldom behaves in an aggressive manner, and does not lose his temper easily. He is reliable and somewhat pessimistic (Eysenck & Rachman in Mischel, 1973, p. 28).

According to Eysenck, the extrovert is a person who is active, sociable, talkative, gregarious, impulsive, emotionally expressive, craves excitement, seeks novelty and change, and has a high propensity for risk-taking. The introvert, on the other hand, is a person who is quiet, passive, reserved, introspective, planned, distant towards others, emotionally unexpressive, and has a low propensity for risk-taking. Both introverts and extroverts can be said to have certain advantages and disadvantages. However, extreme cases can cause considerable difficulties. “Very high or low scores on any personality trait or type suggest an imbalance in the person which is not necessarily fatal, but which needs considerable care in handling” (Eysenck, 1975, p. 20). It is quite natural that few people closely resemble these two extreme types of personality. No one is entirely introverted or entirely extroverted; the majority of people tend to be somewhat in the middle (Eysenck, 1975). However there is typically a preponderance of one of the two tendencies which is important in understanding the person’s life-style.
Biological Basis of Introversion-Extroversion

Eysenck (1967) proposed that individual differences between introverts and extroverts are determined by biological factors as well as psychological factors. He claimed that behavioral differences between introverts and extroverts are because of genetically transferred physiological differences in the functioning of the brain's reticular activating system. This system monitors incoming neural impulses resulting from environmental stimulation which either stimulates (excites) or inhibits responses of higher brain centers to the stimulation. The system, thus, controls the arousal level of the cortex of the brain. The functioning of this system differs for introverts and extroverts in such a way that introverts have higher arousal levels, and as a result, exhibit more restricted behavior than do extroverts under the same conditions of stimulation. Hence, introverts are characterized by greater sensitivity to stimulation than extroverts (Stelmack, 1990).

The differences in the arousal levels of introverts and extroverts cause them to adopt different behavioral and attitudinal preferences and tendencies. Extroverts, who have lower arousal levels, need the presence of other persons, like to engage in social activities, sports, and talking, tend to act aggressively and impulsively, and crave excitement, because they need stimulation. On the other hand, introverts tend to be introspective, reserved, passive, unaggressive, and prefer reading to talking, because social situations are overstimulating for them (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964 cited in Graziano, Feldsman & Rahe, 1985). On the whole, Eysenck's view that introversion-
Extroversion is determined by biological factors has been supported by a number of research studies (Stelmack, 1990).

**Introversion-Extroversion and Academic Achievement**

Eysenck (1957, cited in Skehan, 1989) suggests that extroverts are more easily distracted from studying because of their gregariousness and inability to concentrate for long periods, and that they build up reactive inhibition (or fatigue) to learning more quickly. Based on this conviction, researchers have predicted that introverts would have higher academic achievement than extroverts. However, this prediction has been verified only for older learners. The results of studies in this domain have shown that extroverts are more successful than introverts during the preschool and primary school ages, up until 12-15 years of age. After this period a transition takes place and introverts become academically superior to extroverts (Anthony, 1973).

A study conducted by Savage (1966, cited in Handley, 1973) with eight-year-old children showed that extroverts, as measured by Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI), had higher academic achievement scores than introverts. In another study by Rushton (1966), in which personality was measured by the Cattell Children’s Personality questionnaire, it was reported that eleven-year-old children’s academic success correlated significantly with extroversion.

A large-scale study with 4000 eleven-year-old children was conducted by Eysenck and Cookson (1969, cited in Anthony, 1973). The subjects were given the Junior
Eysenck Personality Inventory (JEPI). The findings, again, revealed significant correlations between extroversion and pupils’ school achievement. Entwistle and Cunningham (1968, cited in Entwistle, 1972), using nearly 3000 children of approximately thirteen years of age, found no significant correlation between extroversion and school achievement. Their findings, however, showed that extroverted girls and introverted boys, as measured by the JEPI, were more successful than introverted girls and extroverted boys. A later study by Entwistle and Welsh (1969, cited in Entwistle & Entwistle, 1970), using 2538 children between eleven and fourteen years of age, found extroversion to be negatively related with academic achievement.

In another study, Entwistle & Entwistle (1970) reported that there is no significant correlation between extroversion and academic success among British university students. They found that introversion was associated with good study methods. Lynn and Gordon (1961), using university students as samples, found a relationship between introversion and academic success.

The results of these studies show that there is a positive correlation between extroversion and academic achievement during the early school years and a negative correlation during the later school years and at university (Elliot, 1972). Young extroverted school children tend to be more successful than their introverted counterparts, but among older students this correlation disappears and is reversed. In general, research studies seem to support Eysenck’s view that extroverts perform slightly lower than introverts with respect to academic achievement.
The findings of research work regarding the relationship between introversion-extroversion and academic achievement are relatively consistent and clear. However, as it will be seen in the following section, the results of research studies in second language learning are not so clear-cut and internally consistent with the body of research in academic achievement. Therefore, it seems necessary to distinguish between general learning predictions and second language learning predictions. Perhaps second language learning is a much more complex activity, involving large numbers of variables. Thus, it should be kept in mind that the findings regarding academic achievement need to be interpreted cautiously and may not be relevant to second language learning. A number of variables must be taken into consideration before forming hypotheses and making predictions regarding introversion-extroversion and second language learning.

Introversion-Extroversion and Second Language Learning

The effects of the personality traits of introversion-extroversion on second language learning have been investigated in several research studies which were generally based on two major hypotheses (Ellis, 1994). The first and the most widely researched hypothesis is that extroverts, because of their ability to create opportunities to practice and gain input in the target language, learn more rapidly and are more successful than introverted learners, especially in developing basic interpersonal communication skills. The second hypothesis is that introverts are more successful than extroverts in developing
cognitive academic language ability probably because they are more focused on grammar and they spend more time reading and writing.

Although it is not quite clear whether introversion-introversion directly promotes or hinders the second language learning process, it seems reasonable that extroverts may find it easier to make contacts with other speakers of the target language and, therefore, obtain more input. Rubin (1975), for example, claims that extroverts may have an advantage over introverts in learning a second language because they may exploit more opportunities to communicate with others. Krashen (1981), similarly, views outgoingness (one of the essential features of extroversion) as a facilitating factor which may contribute to ‘acquisition’. He argues that outgoing learners, who find it easier to make contacts with other users of the target language and as a result have access to more practice in the target language, obtain more comprehensible input and learn more rapidly than their inhibited and reserved counterparts. Krashen claims that outgoing learners, because they utilize no conscious knowledge of grammar rules and monitoring of their language performance, are likely to be less hesitant and inhibited in speaking. In contrast, introverted learners will often tend to be consciously aware of the rules of the language and frequently monitor their speech production which will result in a hesitant, overcareful style of speaking because of their overconcern with correctness and constant rule-searching.

The hypothesis that students who are involved in more interaction in the classroom will be higher achievers was supported in Seliger’s (1977) research. The
subjects, adult learners studying English as a second language in the United States, were divided into two groups: High Input Generators (HIGs), and Low Input Generators (LIGs). HIGs are described as learners who interact intensively, who seek out opportunities to use the target language, and who cause others to direct language towards them. LIGs are those who avoid interacting with others or adopt a passive role in language interaction situations. Based on data obtained from classroom observations and achievement tests, the two groups were compared for performance in language tests and for the amount of interaction that they generated in and outside the classroom. HIGs were significantly better than LIGs in test results. They also appeared to have more contact with the target language speakers outside the classroom. Seliger, thus, concludes that learners who make active use of interaction opportunities are faster learners.

There have been several studies to specify the characteristics of the 'good language learner' (e.g. Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975; Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, Todesco, 1978) in which teachers and students often stated that qualities associated with extroversion such as talkativeness, outgoingness, and self-confidence were desired qualities to be adopted by learners. In a study by Naiman et al. (1978), the majority of the good language learners believed extroversion to be an asset in language learning, especially in developing communication skills. Rubin (1975) and Stern (1975) describe the good language learner as active, outgoing, uninhibited, highly motivated to communicate, and attending to meaning rather than structure.
Based on classroom observations and the literature on good language learners, researchers have generally assumed that extroversion would promote second language proficiency. They suggested that more sociable learners would be more inclined to talk, join groups, participate in class, volunteer and engage in practice activities, and they would be more likely to take advantage of opportunities to improve their communication skills. Thus, extroversion was regarded as an appropriate personality trait for successful language learning.

On the other hand, as Brown (1973) states, the common view that extroverts are better learners may be misleading. Since extroversion is highly valued and encouraged in the classroom, it is possible that extroverts are given more of a chance to participate in the lessons out of the teachers’ desire to generate speaking opportunities. This bias may be at the expense of neglecting introverts. While benefiting extroverts, this situation may be disadvantageous for introverts, depriving them of equal practice opportunities.

Introverts, too, may possess some characteristics that are well suited to certain learning situations. For example, when the interpersonal aspect of language learning is emphasized extroversion would be an asset, but introversion might well be regarded as advantageous for the systematic study of a language (Stern, 1975). More specifically, perhaps, the type of instruction which emphasizes individual study and knowledge of explicit grammar rules may be better suited to introverted learners while an audiolingual or communicative approach which emphasizes group participation and oral practice may appeal to extroverted learners.
As mentioned earlier, in general, research studies fail to show an explicitly defined effect of introversion-extroversion, on second language learning. The results are often contradictory and inconclusive (Strong, 1983). While some researchers have found extroversion and language proficiency to be positively related (Chastain, 1975; Rossier, 1975), others have found either a negative correlation (Busch, 1982) or no relationship at all (Naiman, Frohlich, Stern and Todesco, 1978).

Strong (1983) reviewed the results of studies which had investigated extroversion or similar traits associated with extroversion such as, outgoingness, sociability, empathy, and popularity. He claimed that discrepancies and conflicts between the results of these studies might be explained if an important variable, the assessment format of the language, was taken into consideration. He suggested that a distinction be made between ‘natural communicative language’ (language used for interpersonal communication) and ‘linguistic task language’ (language used in a formal test) so that the effects of the language assessed could be investigated. When grouping studies according to whether or not they found a relationship between the type of language sampled and extroversion (or related traits), it has been shown that a relationship exists if ‘natural communicative language’ was assessed in the study. When ‘linguistic task language’ was assessed, often no relationship was found except when it was elicited in a somewhat naturalistic manner, for example through an informal interview. Thus, the results of existing studies seem to suggest some relationship between extroversion and communicative skills depending on the research design. At the same time it can be inferred that there is a need for a more
 qualitative approach to research based on interviews and observations rather than depending solely on tests and self-report questionnaires for measuring these variables.

Naiman, et al. (1978), administering the extroversion scale of the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) to junior and senior high school students in Ontario, tried to find a correlation between extroversion and second language proficiency in French. The assumption that good language learners would attain higher scores on the extroversion scale was not verified. They found no significant relationship between students’ answers to the EPI and results of proficiency tests measuring listening comprehension and sentence imitation. Students who had been reported by investigators to be introverts on the basis of classroom observation scored almost identically on proficiency tests with students who had been reported to be extroverts. The researchers’ explanation for this finding was that the validity of the EPI might be doubtful or that classroom personality might be different from overall personality. However, in this study it was also found that certain behaviors associated with extroversion such as, hand raising and calling out answers were correlated positively, though not significantly, with second language proficiency.

Swain and Burnaby (1976, cited in Strong, 1983) did not find any relationship between the teacher-reported traits of extroversion, sociability, and talkativeness and proficiency among a group of kindergartners in French immersion and French as a second language programs in Canada. In another study, Suter (1977) measured English pronunciation skills of 61 foreign students in American universities. The subjects’
extroversion scores on the EPI were not found to correlate significantly with the scores
given for pronunciation accuracy. Speakers who were more ‘concerned’ about their
pronunciation tended to be more accurate pronouncers.

Chastain (1975) investigated the relationship between sociability and achievement
among American university students studying French, Spanish, and German. He found
that outgoing personality, as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Reserved vs. Outgoing
Personality Scale, correlated significantly with the final course grades of students
studying German and Spanish, but not French. However, students’ grades alone may not
be an indicator of proficiency, the teacher might have simply favored and rewarded the
more extroverted students (Busch, 1982) since it is a common tendency among teachers
to take extroversion as an appropriate and desired personality trait for second language
learning (Brown, 1994).

Another study, using the Eysenck Personality Inventory, was conducted by
Rossier (1975). He investigated whether introversion-extroversion was a significant
variable in the learning of English by Spanish speaking high school students in the United
States. He hypothesized that extroverted students would become proficient in speaking
English more rapidly than their more introverted classmates because in addition to their
formal study in class they would take greater advantage of opportunities outside class to
be in close contact with native speakers of English. Their greater exposure to authentic
English would, therefore, positively affect their progress in learning the language. Two
tests were administered to students; a Spanish version of the Eysenck Personality
Inventory (EPI) for a rating of each student on an introversion-extroversion scale, and the Pictorial Stimulus Test to which students’ responses were taped and later rated by three judges for a measure of oral English production and its four separate components: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. In addition, students completed a questionnaire which was designed to obtain information about their use of English outside the classroom. A significant correlation was not found between introversion-extroversion and total English production when no variables were controlled in the study. However, when global measures of language proficiency and the time spent in the United States were treated as control variables, highly significant correlations were found between extroversion and oral fluency, which was a component of total oral production.

Strong (1983) researched the relationship between various dimensions of personality and communication skills of 13 Spanish-speaking kindergartners learning English in an ESL setting in the United States. In his study, the overall construct of social style was divided into seven social style descriptors: talkativeness, responsiveness, gregariousness, assertiveness, social competence, and popularity all of which are associated with extroversion. Assessments of social styles were derived through classroom observation and the Spanish version of Coan and Cattell’s Early School Personality Questionnaire (ESPQ). Based on natural communicative language samples, three language measures were developed: structural knowledge, play vocabulary, and pronunciation.
Correlations of social styles with language measures revealed that neither of the traits derived through ESPQ (i.e. assertiveness and extroversion) was statistically correlated with any of the language measures. However, the three variables derived from long-term observation (i.e. talkativeness, responsiveness, and gregariousness) accounted for nearly all the statistically significant correlations with language measures. Strong argues that the lack of significant correlations between extroversion, assertiveness and language measures might be due to the inefficiency of the ESPQ in assessing social styles. He emphasizes the importance of natural communicative language and the greater reliability of data obtained from long term-observation over that acquired from psychological tests in the field of personality research.

In Strong's study, although extroversion in itself is not found to be correlated with measures of language proficiency, it is demonstrated that there is a relationship between aspects of sociability or outgoingness and natural communicative language skills. More specifically, the results suggest that children who are characterized as talkative and verbally responsive in their first language tend to be more efficient than others in learning English.

Busch (1982), in her study, explored correlation between introversion-extroversion and English proficiency of Japanese students of English. The subjects, 80 junior college students and 105 adult night school students, took a standardized English test and answered the questions on the Eysenck Personality Inventory. In addition, 45 students from the junior college group were randomly selected to participate in oral
interviews. The interviews were taped and then evaluated for English proficiency by two judges.

Busch hypothesized that extroverted students would be more proficient than introverted students because they may take greater advantage of rare opportunities within EFL settings to practice with native speakers. The rationale for undertaking her study in an EFL setting was that in an ESL situation even introverted students might find themselves in situations where they must communicate in English, whereas in an EFL situation, introverted students may get the opportunity to practice the language only in the classroom, while, on the other hand, extroverted students may create opportunities both inside and outside the classroom. This situation may put the extrovert at an obvious advantage over the introvert, which may not be the case in an ESL setting. In other words, introversion-extroversion may be a more significant variable in an EFL context.

Busch also stated that in eastern countries such as, Japan, introversion levels are higher than in western countries, and this may be reflected in students’ behavioral preferences and tendencies while learning a second language. Because cultural and social norms exert a great influence over students’ behavioral patterns, the effects of being extroverted may be more conspicuous in Japan than in other countries. Busch’s hypothesis that extroverts would be more proficient than introverts in English proficiency turned out to be contradictory to the findings of the study. The results showed a negative correlation between introversion-extroversion and subjects’ scores on written tests and oral interviews. In the oral interviews, introverts were significantly better than extroverts.
in pronunciation, which was one of the four factors measured. She argued that the introverts are more successful because they take more time to pronounce correctly, they are more planned, more inclined to focus on structure and correctness, and less impulsive than extroverts.

Conclusion

As this review of literature suggests, the results of studies which have dealt with the role of introversion-extroversion in second language learning are, in fact, rather complicated and tend to differ according to the cultural and educational settings in which they were conducted. Although extroversion is generally accepted to be superior to introversion in terms of promoting oral proficiency, several factors should be taken into consideration before attempting to draw conclusions and generalizations. It is apparent that different cultures value personality traits differently and norms of interaction and behavior may exhibit different characteristics cross-culturally. As Brown (1994) states "what in one culture (say, the United States) may appear as introversion, is in another culture (say, Japan) respect and politeness" (p. 147). The three different cultural settings (Canadian, American, and Japanese) in which the above mentioned studies were conducted may perhaps account for some of the variance in correlations between introversion-extroversion and second language learning. Furthermore, whether a student is introverted or extroverted may depend on a specific classroom setting that he or she
happens to be in. In a traditional classroom situation, such as one in Japan, students may be required to exhibit introverted behavior out of respect for the teacher,

...thus the situation itself may prevent students from obtaining as much input in the foreign language as they would in a different situation. As a result, introversion-extroversion would have very little to do with foreign language proficiency in an EFL situation unless the classroom learning situation were changed (Busch, 1982. p.130).

In sum, whether the findings of previous studies on introversion-extroversion can be generalized to various settings and situations is open to question. Most of these studies were conducted in western cultures which bear little resemblance to the Turkish culture in many respects. It is possible that introversion-extroversion may be perceived and treated differently in Turkey than in the United States, Canada, or Japan. If the social dimension of introversion-extroversion is taken into account, the findings of previous research may not be relevant for Turkish learners. In order to determine the cross-cultural validity of the findings of previous research studies, more research is needed. This study aims to investigate whether there is a relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency of Turkish learners in an EFL setting. It is intended to fill a gap in the literature regarding this aspect of personality in this cultural setting.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the personality traits of introversion-extroversion are related to oral proficiency of learners of English in Turkey. Studies conducted prior to this one have generally investigated the relationship between introversion-extroversion and overall language proficiency. Few of these studies had a particular focus on the relationship between introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency. As discussed in the previous chapter, the results of many studies in this line of research show a tendency to be biased by several cultural and educational variables particular to the setting in which the studies were conducted. While it has been generally confirmed that there is a relationship between extroversion and oral proficiency, it is difficult to make generalizations based on the results of such studies because of these variables. Therefore, more research is needed in various cultural and educational settings.

In order to investigate the relationship between introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency, several research questions were addressed. The main question, which was related to the relationship between introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency, was followed by additional questions aiming to investigate the relationship between introversion-extroversion and components of oral proficiency, i.e. pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and knowledge of vocabulary.

This chapter presents the subjects, instruments, and the methods that were used for data collection and data analysis. In the first part, the context of the study and the
subjects are introduced. Next, is a description of the instruments used in the study. Lastly, the data collection and data analysis procedures are presented.

Subjects

This study was carried out at the Preparatory School of Erciyes University (PSEU) which offers a one-year intensive training program in English for the students of medicine, economics, engineering, and civil aviation prior to studies in their departments. At the beginning of the academic year the students are required to take a proficiency exam which is administered by the testing unit of the PSEU. The students who pass this exam are entitled to start their freshman year in their faculties. The students who do not take the exam or fail in the exam take a placement test and are placed at the three different levels (A, B, C) of the program according to their scores on the placement test. The levels can be characterized as: A, intermediate; B, preintermediate; and C, beginner. The program offered by the school aims to help students of all levels attain an upper-intermediate or advanced level of proficiency in writing, reading, speaking, and listening skills.

The reason for selecting this institution as the site of the study is that the students at PSEU are believed to be a representative sample of many other preparatory school students in Turkey in terms of their educational and socio-economic backgrounds. Another reason is that it is the home institution of the researcher which made the data
collection procedure easier. Any recommendations based on this study would also be easier to implement.

The subjects for this study were selected from among the students of level B (preintermediate) classes. In this level there were three classes with a total of 97 students, the average proficiency level of the students being 65 out of 100 as assessed by the proficiency exam of PSEU administered at the beginning of the academic year. The subjects had an age range of 17 to 24. At the outset of the study all of the 97 students were given the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) (Appendix A) for the purpose of classifying them as introverts and extroverts. Students were also asked to complete a biodata questionnaire (Appendix A) which aimed to gather information about their age, sex, years of English study, and educational background. Some students were eliminated since they did not respond to all of the items on the MPI or the biodata questionnaire. In addition, the students of foreign nationalities and those who have lived and studied in a foreign country for a long period of time were left out of the study since they might lessen the homogeneity of the sample group. Thus, 10 students were excluded from the study and the total number of students who were used as subjects was 87 (35 introverts; 52 extroverts). Later, out of this group of 87, 28 students who had the highest and lowest scores for introversion and extroversion, as determined by the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI), were selected and assigned to two groups (14 introverts, 14 extroverts) for oral interviews in order to assess their oral proficiency. In the selection of the subjects, certain variables such as, gender, the type of high school of graduation, and their
faculties were also taken into consideration since they might be important variables in the analysis and the interpretation of the results. These variables were evenly distributed within and across the two groups as much as possible. As a result, seven female and seven male Turkish subjects of various educational backgrounds (e.g. Anatolian high school, private high school, and state high school graduates), and various academic study fields (e.g. medicine, economics, and engineering) were selected for each group. Table 1 shows the MPI scores of subjects who were selected for oral interviews.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects' Scores on the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x}_{\text{Introverts}} = 17.3 \]

\[ \bar{x}_{\text{Extroverts}} = 40.2 \]

Note: minimum score: 0; maximum score: 48.

Instruments

The Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI)

The Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) (1970) was used for assessing the subjects' introversion-extroversion tendencies (see Appendix A). The MPI, which was
designed by Eysenck, is one of the most popular self-report measures of introversion-extroversion. Its validity has been supported by research studies which used it with groups of different cultural backgrounds and age ranges (Bulut, 1992). This instrument was previously used in two research studies in Turkey. Bulut (1992) used it in his study to investigate the nature of student class participation in introverted and extroverted teachers’ classes. In another study, a Turkish version of the MPI was used by Baysal (1994) who looked at the behavioral characteristics of introverted and extroverted students in their composition writing processes.

In order to avoid potential language problems during administration, the MPI was translated into Turkish. To this end, two Turkish instructors of English were asked to translate the MPI into Turkish. Then, a third instructor was asked to backtranslate the Turkish translations into English in order to see to what extent they paralleled the original English version. The best translation was determined by comparing both translations with the original English version. For further corrections, the instrument was piloted on a group of 30 freshman students at Hacettepe University. The piloting made it possible to reword certain items and instructions and give the instrument its final shape. The Turkish version of the MPI is reproduced in Appendix B.

The MPI consists of 24 items: 15 measuring subjects’ level of extroversion and 9 measuring introversion. The items are in yes/no question form. The items measuring extroversion are given 2 points for each ‘yes’ answer, 0 point for each ‘no’ answer, and 1 point if a question mark (?) is used. Items measuring introversion are accorded 0 point
for each 'yes' answer, 2 points for each 'no' answer, and 1 point for each (?). The highest possible score on the MPI is 48. The subjects who are closest to 48 points are identified as extroverts, the subjects who are closest to 0 are identified as introverts (Eysenck, 1970). In addition to the MPI, a biodata questionnaire was administered to the subjects which consisted of questions for gathering information about the subjects' age, sex, educational background, and years of English study (see Appendix A).

The Oral Interviews

On the basis of the MPI, students (n=87) were classified as introverted or extroverted. Subjects who scored from 0 to 24 were assigned to the group of introverts (n=35) and students who scored from 25 to 48 were assigned to the group of extroverts (n=52). From each of these two groups, 28 subjects who had the closest scores to the two extremes (0 to 48) on the introversion-extroversion scale of the MPI were chosen to take part in the oral interviews (14 introverts; 14 extroverts). In other words, subjects who participated in oral interviews were the most strongly introverted and extroverted ones.

The oral interviews took about 10-15 minutes for each subject and were tape recorded for future rating by the judges. In the first part of the interview, which took about five minutes, the interviewer (the researcher himself) asked the interviewees questions related to their family backgrounds, environments, interests, future plans, and other related topics. These questions became gradually more detailed. The initial questions were intended to serve the purpose of putting the interviewee at ease and reducing the stressful atmosphere. These questions also aimed at making a tentative
estimate of the speaker's level of proficiency, and determining how well he or she could function in a communicative situation which formed the basis of proceeding questions.

In the second part of the interview, the interviewees were asked to describe preselected pictures illustrating various situations and scenes taken from films or stage plays. In addition to the task of describing the scene, the students were also asked to make up and tell a brief story based on some cues in the pictures. This part of the interview aimed at raising the conversation to a higher difficulty level in order to determine the strengths and limitations in the subjects' level of oral proficiency in terms of pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary.

Procedures

The subjects were first given the biodata questionnaire and the MPI as a combined form at the beginning of the data collection procedure. These instruments were administered during regular class time and the students took about 15 minutes to complete them. The subjects were briefly informed about the purpose of the study. About one month later oral interviews were administered to 28 students who were chosen on the basis of their introversion-extroversion scores on the MPI, and the selection criteria described previously.

The tape-recorded speech samples obtained from oral interviews were used for rating the subjects' oral proficiency by two native English-speaking judges who were English teaching professionals. Prior to evaluations of the speech samples, a training
session with the judges was held in order to reach a basic agreement upon certain standards and methods of evaluation so that a reasonable degree of uniformity could be obtained. For this purpose, judges also rated some practice interviews during the training session.

As the first step, the tape recorded speech samples were rated holistically for each subject in terms of overall oral proficiency. For this, the judges were provided with a set of criteria (adapted from Harris, 1969) consisting of descriptions for six-separate levels of proficiency (see Appendix C). Then, they were asked to rate each speech sample on a six-point Likert-type scale as shown below:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Modest</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, by using an analytic method of scoring, the speech samples were rated for the components of oral proficiency, namely: pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary. The judges recorded their evaluations for each component of oral proficiency separately based on analytic scoring criteria (adapted from Hughes, 1989) which consisted of behavioral descriptions across numerical values of 1 through 6 (see Appendix D). Adding the scores on each subcategory also gave total analytic score of overall oral proficiency which was compared to the holistic overall oral proficiency measure in order to determine to what extent both scores were consistent and reliable.
Having obtained the results of evaluations, the interrater reliability for the ratings of the oral interviews was calculated.

Data Analysis

For analyzing the data, the students’ scores on the MPI, and the judges’ ratings for each oral interview measure (overall oral proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary) were processed using Pearson product-moment correlation and t-test analyses.

At the outset, the interrater reliability of the judges’ scores was calculated. For this, the separate sets of scores given by the two judges for each component of oral interview were correlated using Pearson product-moment correlation in order to examine the reliability of their ratings. Next, for investigating whether there were significant relationships between introversion-extroversion and the components of oral proficiency, Pearson product-moment correlation was used. For these analyses, introverted and extroverted subjects’ scores on the MPI were correlated with their scores on overall oral proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary components of the oral interview, respectively. Finally, In order to test whether there were significant differences between the mean scores of introverted and extroverted subject groups on each component of the oral interview, t-test analyses were used. In this chapter the subjects, instruments, methods of data collection, and the analytical procedures used in the study were introduced. The following chapter gives greater detail as to how statistical analyses were carried out and presents the results of these analyses.
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Overview of the Study

The intent of this study was to explore the relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and the oral proficiency of learners of English in an EFL context in Turkey. In order to measure introversion-extroversion, the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI) was used, and a total of 28 students most clearly identified as both introverts and extroverts were selected out of a group of 87 and then administered oral interviews for the purpose of assessing their oral proficiency levels.

The overall construct of oral proficiency was broken into four subskills: pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary. Two native English-speaking judges who were English teaching specialists rated 28 tape-recorded oral interviews on a six-point Likert scale using both holistic and analytical methods of scoring. First, the judges listened to the tapes for a holistic assessment of overall oral proficiency based on their impressions of the subjects. Then, they listened a second or third time and judged the subjects analytically in terms of each subskill. The scores for each subskill were averaged to obtain the analytical overall oral proficiency of each subject. The two methods of assessment, holistic and analytical, were compared in order to find out to what extent they were consistent. A correlation coefficient which was highly significant at .001 level revealed that the two scores of overall oral proficiency were consistent and reliable.
Overview of the Analytical Procedures

The statistical analyses were carried out as follows. At the outset, the interrater reliability of the scores given by the judges for overall oral proficiency and its components was calculated using Pearson product-moment correlation. Next, in order to determine whether introversion and extroversion were significantly related to oral proficiency and its components a Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated for each relationship. In addition, t-test analyses were used for investigating whether there were significant differences between the mean scores of introverted and extroverted subjects with respect to overall oral proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary.

Although it was not one of the initial purposes of the study, a further analysis was also carried out using all of the B level (preintermediate) students at the preparatory school of Erciyes University (PSEU) as subjects (n=87, including the 28 students who participated in oral interviews) in order to determine whether the introversion-extroversion tendencies of students correlated significantly with general achievement and speaking proficiency. It should be noted that the terms ‘oral proficiency’ and ‘speaking proficiency’ refer to two different constructs in this study. Oral proficiency refers to students’ proficiency levels based on oral interviews administered by the researcher, whereas speaking proficiency refers to a measure obtained from the results of speaking tests (mostly in the form of semi-structured interviews) given by the testing unit of PSEU. In addition, the construct of ‘general achievement’ has been used as a term to
refer to a language proficiency measure consisting of an averaged score of all written and oral tests that have been given by PSEU during the two semesters.

In order to investigate the relationship between introversion-extroversion and general achievement and speaking proficiency, the data obtained from the students’ scores on the MPI, their average scores in listening, speaking, writing, and grammar tests (for general achievement), and the average of speaking tests (for speaking proficiency) were used. At the outset, the subjects’ introversion-extroversion scores on the MPI were correlated with the average of scores obtained in all tests and with the average of speaking tests, respectively. Later, the mean scores of introverted and extroverted subjects’ for general achievement and speaking proficiency were compared using t-test analyses. In addition to the group of 87 students (group A), the 28 students who had been administered the oral interviews (group B) were also used for the same statistical analyses mentioned above.

Results of the Study

The first step in analyzing the data was to investigate the interrater reliability of the scores given by the two judges. For this, Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated. Table 2 shows the interrater reliability coefficients for the components of the scoring criteria.
Table 2

Interrater Reliability of the Judges’ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall proficiency</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05    **p< .01    ***p< .001

All of the correlation coefficients are significant, though at different levels, and therefore the averaged scores of both judges can be considered reliable to be used for the statistical analyses that follow. Judge 1 had a tendency to give higher scores than judge 2. The differences between the means and standard deviations of scores given by the two judges can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Scores Given by Both Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall oral proficiency</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical accuracy</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: minimum score: 1; maximum score: 6
In order to investigate the relationship between introversion-extroversion and overall oral proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary, a Pearson Correlation Matrix was constructed including the variables used in the study. The independent variable was the personality trait which consisted of two levels: introversion and extroversion. The dependent variables, on the other hand, were overall oral proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary.

The first research question addressed in the study sought to find an answer to whether there was a relationship between being introverted and extroverted, as assessed by the MPI, and student scores on the oral interview with respect to overall oral proficiency. The second, third, fourth, and fifth research questions aimed at finding out whether there were significant relationships between introverted and extroverted subjects’ scores on the MPI and on the pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary components of the oral interview, respectively.

At the outset, a correlation matrix of the variables abstracted from the data obtained through the MPI and the judges’ scores given for each component was developed. Introverted and extroverted subjects’ scores on the MPI were correlated with their scores on the overall proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary components of the oral interview in order to determine the degree of correlation between these variables. Table 4 gives the results of Pearson Correlations between introverted subjects’ scores on the MPI and the components of the oral interview.
Table 4

Pearson Correlations between Introverted Subjects’ (n=14) Scores on MPI and Components of the Oral interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall oral proficiency</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical accuracy</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that none of the variables in the study correlated significantly with introversion. The correlation between introversion and pronunciation produced a correlation coefficient at p=.105 which was the closest to the significance level of p<.05.

In Table 5 the results of correlations between extroverted subjects’ scores on the MPI and the components of the oral interview are presented. All of the components except grammar are negatively correlated with extroversion. However, none of these correlations are significant at p<.05 level.

Table 5

Pearson Correlations between Extroverted Subjects’ (n=14) Scores on MPI and Components of the Oral Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall oral proficiency</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>-.265</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical accuracy</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next stage of the data analysis procedure was to investigate whether there were significant differences between the introverted and extroverted subjects in terms of overall proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary. Judged ratings of subjects were treated as scores and the mean scores for introverted and extroverted subject groups were computed for each component of the oral interview. Then, the mean scores were analyzed using t-tests in order to determine whether there were significant differences between the two groups. Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 give the results of t-tests for each component.

Application of t-tests revealed no significant differences between the introverted and extroverted subjects in overall proficiency, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary. However, there was a significant difference between the two groups with respect to the pronunciation component (t=2.26; df=26; p=.032) (see Table 7).

Table 6

T-test for Overall Oral Proficiency Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=14 for introverts and extroverts; minimum score: 1; maximum score: 6
Table 7

T-test for Pronunciation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=14 for introverts and extroverts; minimum score: 1; maximum score: 6

Table 8

T-test for Fluency Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=14 for introverts and extroverts; minimum score: 1; maximum score: 6

Table 9

T-test for Grammatical Accuracy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=14 for introverts and extroverts; minimum score: 1; maximum score: 6

Table 10

T-test for Vocabulary Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=14 for introverts and extroverts; minimum score: 1; maximum score: 6
Another question posed during the data analysis procedure was whether introversion-extroversion would be related to “general achievement” and “speaking proficiency”. As mentioned earlier, the term “general achievement”, was used in this study for referring to a measure of each students’ general achievement in the program as determined by an average of all tests (reading, writing, listening, speaking, and grammar) administered at PSEU throughout the two semesters.

As distinct from oral proficiency, which was assessed through oral interviews, the term “speaking proficiency” was used for referring to a measure of proficiency which was obtained through averaging the students’ scores on all speaking tests administered by the testing unit of PSEU.

Students were assigned to introversion-extroversion groups based on their scores on the MPI. Students who scored between 0 and 24 on the MPI were introverts and those who scored between 25 and 48 were extroverts.

All of the 87 students at B level (preintermediate) of PSEU (group A), including those who had participated in oral interviews, were used for the statistical analyses. In addition, the 28 students who had been administered the oral interviews (group B) were used separately for the same analyses.

In order to explore the relationship between introversion-extroversion and general achievement and speaking proficiency in group A, first, the MPI scores of introverted students (n=35) were correlated with their mean scores in all tests and their mean scores in speaking tests. Results, given in Table 11, did not indicate significant correlations.
Then, extroverted students’ MPI scores (n=52) were correlated with their general achievement and speaking proficiency scores (Table 12). Again, no significant correlations were found. Results in Tables 11 and 12 indicate that introversion correlated positively with general achievement (r=.249), while extroversion produced a negative correlation (r=-.129). As for speaking proficiency, extroversion was positively correlated with students’ speaking scores (r=.133). Introversion and speaking, on the other hand, were negatively correlated (r=-.049). However, none of these correlations reached significance at p<.05.

Table 11

**Pearson Correlations between Introverted Subjects’ (n=35) Scores on MPI and PSEU Test Scores (Group A).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General achievement</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

**Pearson Correlations between Extroverted Subjects’ (n=52) Scores on MPI and PSEU Test Scores (group A).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General attainment</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to test the significance of the difference between introverted and extroverted students' mean scores in terms of general achievement and speaking proficiency, t-tests were applied. Table 13 gives the results of t-tests for general achievement. The means of general achievement scores for introverts and extroverts differed significantly and produced a t-value of 6.19 which was highly significant at p=.001.

Table 13
T-test for General Achievement (Group A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75.34</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.67</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: maximum score: 100

Table 14 shows the result of t-test for speaking proficiency. The mean speaking scores for introverts and extroverts were almost identical and, therefore, no significant differences were found between the two groups.

Table 14
T-test for Speaking Proficiency (Group A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73.96</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74.93</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: maximum score: 100
The same analyses were also carried out with the 28 subjects who had been selected for the oral interviews (group B). These students were the most introverted and extroverted students as determined by their scores on the MPI. The correlation of introverted students’ MPI scores with their general achievement scores produced a correlation coefficient which was significant at \( p = 0.039 \). However, no significant correlation was found between their MPI scores and speaking scores (Table 15).

**Table 15**

**Pearson Correlations between Introverted Subjects' (n=14) Scores on MPI and PSEU Test Scores (Group B).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General achievement</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking proficiency</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 16 gives the result of correlations between the extroverted students’ MPI scores and their general achievement and speaking proficiency scores.*

**Table 16**

**Pearson Correlations between Extroverted Subjects' (n=14) Scores on MPI and PSEU Test Scores (Group B).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General achievement</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking proficiency</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results indicated no significant correlations between the variables. However, correlation between MPI and speaking proficiency scores almost reached significance (p=.084) at p<.05 level.

In order to test the difference between the mean scores of introverted and extroverted subjects with respect to general achievement and speaking proficiency t-test analyses were used. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between introverts and extroverts with respect to their general achievement scores (Table 17).

Table 17
T-test for General Achievement (Group B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>76.34</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>67.13</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=14 for introverts and extroverts; maximum score: 100

However, no significant difference was found between the two groups' mean speaking proficiency scores (Table 18).

Table 18
T-test for Speaking Proficiency (Group B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverts</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverts</td>
<td>76.32</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=14 for introverts and extroverts; maximum score: 100
In this chapter statistical procedures and results were presented. The next chapter deals with the interpretation of the results of the present study and relates the findings to the relevant research conducted in this field.
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

This study investigated the relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency in second language learning. The subjects were a group of students at the Preparatory School of Erciyes University (PSEU). At the outset of the study 28 students were selected from a group of 87 based on their scores on a Turkish version of the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI). The subjects were assigned to two groups as either introverts or extroverts (14 for each group) and then administered the oral interviews which aimed to collect the data regarding the oral proficiency levels of the subjects. The interviews were tape-recorded to be judged by two native-speaking English teaching professionals in terms of overall oral proficiency, pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary. The judges used holistic scoring criteria for overall oral proficiency and analytical scoring criteria for pronunciation, fluency, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary. Both scoring criteria consisted of behavioral descriptions corresponding to numerical values on a six-point Likert-type scale (see Appendices C and D).

The introverted and extroverted subjects’ scores on the MPI and the scores given by the judges for each component of the oral interview were used for the statistical analyses. Initially, Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis was used in order to determine the strength of the relationships between introversion-extroversion and the components of oral proficiency. For this, introverted and extroverted students’ scores on
the MPI and their scores on each component of the oral interview were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlation. Next, the means of introverted and extroverted subjects' oral proficiency scores were compared using t-test analyses.

The first part of this chapter presents the results of data analysis and the conclusions drawn from the findings. In the second part, limitations of the study are followed by suggestions for further research and pedagogical implications.

Discussion of Findings and Conclusion

In this study, the main research question investigated whether there was a relationship between the introversion-extroversion tendencies of learners of English and their overall oral proficiency. The results of statistical analyses revealed no significant relationships. Neither introversion nor extroversion seemed to correlate significantly with overall oral proficiency. Similarly the difference between the mean oral proficiency scores obtained by the two groups was well below significance.

This finding is in line with the results of some other studies which also failed to find a relationship between introversion-extroversion and general oral proficiency in English (e.g. Busch, 1982; Rossier, 1975). Although it has been commonly hypothesized by researchers that introversion-extroversion might be directly related to proficiency in second language, especially with respect to oral proficiency, there has been no concrete research evidence to support the existence of such relationships. As Strong (1983) points out, the findings of studies which have been conducted so far often tend to be
contradictory and inconclusive. There may be several reasons for the lack of significant correlations which also apply to the present study.

As Busch (1982) suggests, if a personality trait is measured as an isolated component, there seems to be little possibility of finding a relationship. Perhaps there is an indirect relationship as opposed to a direct relationship between introversion-extroversion and second language learning. In other words, introversion-extroversion may not directly promote or hinder oral proficiency in second language learning, but rather, it contributes in some ways when combined with some other personality variables in specific situations and under certain conditions.

In addition to the difficulty of identifying and measuring personality variables, another difficulty is encountered in measuring oral proficiency. Reviewing the results of studies conducted in this field, Strong (1983) concludes that when measures of language learning are based on natural language use rather than on tests and ratings, there seems to be some relationships between traits associated with extroversion and oral proficiency. Perhaps there is a need for more fine-grained methods of assessing oral proficiency, as well as personality variables, in order to identify such relationships.

In light of the existing body of research and the findings of the present study it may be suggested that there is no clear evidence that extroverts are more successful than introverts in overall oral proficiency. Although extroverts are more likely than introverts to participate actively in oral communication in class, introverts and extroverts seem to
do equally well. Perhaps high levels of classroom participation do not necessarily
enhance oral proficiency.

The second question addressed in this study asked whether there was a
relationship between introversion-extroversion and pronunciation. The resulting
correlation coefficients did not indicate significant relationships between the variables.
However, it appeared that the positive relationship between introversion and
pronunciation \( r=0.451; \ p=0.105 \) came closer to reaching significance at \( p<0.05 \).
Extroversion, on the other hand, was negatively correlated with pronunciation but, again,
this was not significant. When the mean oral proficiency scores for introverts and
extroverts were compared, it was found that there was a significant difference between
the two groups with respect to pronunciation \( t=2.26; \ df=26; \ p=0.032 \) suggesting that
introverts were more proficient than extroverts in English pronunciation.

However, this finding should be interpreted with caution. The difference in the
mean scores of the two groups does not necessarily indicate a relationship between
introversion-extroversion and pronunciation. It is possible that the source of the
difference between the two groups might be due to some factors other than introversion-
extroversion. In other words, the finding that introverts outperformed their extroverted
counterparts may not be because of their personality characteristics but because of some
other variables (such as, intelligence, language aptitude, motivational factors, etc.) that
could not be controlled in the study. However, the significant difference between the two
groups for pronunciation found on the t-test \( p=0.032 \), despite its limitations, can be
interpreted as support to the weak correlation found on the Pearson correlation (p=.105). Thus, a relationship between introversion-extroversion and pronunciation can be said to exist although it is not statistically significant.

This finding lends some support to that of Busch’s (1982) study which found that introverts were significantly better than their extroverted counterparts in the pronunciation component of oral proficiency. In another study, Suter (1976) was not able to find a relationship between introversion-extroversion and pronunciation. However, speakers who were more ‘concerned’ about their pronunciation tended to be more accurate pronouncers.

Previous studies which analyzed the relationship between introversion-extroversion and academic achievement suggest that introverts possess certain positive attributes of learning such as, self-awareness, planning, monitoring, and systematicity (Entwistle & Entwistle, 1970; Anthony, 1973; Elliot, 1972) which may predict higher academic achievement. This suggestion, to a certain extent, may also apply to second language learning, implying that introversion can be regarded as advantageous for the systematic study of a foreign language. In a classroom situation in which concentrated study of grammatical and phonological rules of the language is emphasized, introverts may have an advantage over extroverts (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990). It may be suggested that because introverts are more consciously aware of phonological rules and are more concerned with monitoring their speech production (Krashen, 1981), they may, as a result, come up with more accurate pronunciations than do extroverts. It is also possible
that, due to their ability to have better concentration (Eysenck, 1970), introverts may be more attentive and receptive to sounds and speech processes which may put them at an advantage over extroverts. Although introverts may not have as many practice opportunities as extroverts, perhaps practice is not as good a predictor of better pronunciation as planning, monitoring, systematicity, and self-awareness.

The third question addressed in the study investigated the relationship between introversion-extroversion and fluency. Application of Pearson correlation and t-test analysis did not indicate a significant relationship. Both introverts and extroverts were found to perform equally well on the fluency component of the oral interview. Thus, the common view that extroverts would be more fluent than introverts because of their greater exposure to the spoken language in and outside the classroom (Rossier, 1975; Rubin, 1975; Seliger, 1977) was not confirmed by this study.

The fourth research question in this study aimed to explore the relationship between introversion-extroversion and grammatical accuracy. The results of Pearson correlation and t-test analysis did not indicate a significant relationship between introversion-extroversion and grammatical accuracy.

Busch (1982) found that introverts tended to have higher scores on the grammar component of a standardized English test. However, in her study, the same tendency did not appear for the oral interview test. Because introverts tend to prefer learning situations that focus on formal aspects of second language learning, individualized studies and deductive approaches (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990), it may be postulated that they are likely
to perform better than extroverts on the grammar component of both written and oral tests. However, while introversion is generally found to be related to grammatical accuracy on written tests, no such relationship is found on oral tests. It may be that in written tests introverts have a relatively longer time to monitor and correct grammatical mistakes, whereas in oral interviews, they have limited time to do so since oral production requires more immediate responses and automaticity on the part of the speaker.

The final research question addressed in the study asked whether introversion-extroversion was related to the vocabulary component of the oral interview. Pearson correlation and t-test analysis did not show any significant relationships between introversion-extroversion and vocabulary. A similar finding is reported by Rossier’s (1975) study which also used vocabulary as a component of an oral interview test and failed to find a relationship.

In addition to the initial intent of the study, further analyses were carried out in order to find out whether there were relationships between introversion-extroversion and general achievement and introversion-extroversion and speaking proficiency based on students’ scores on written and oral tests administered by the testing unit of PSEU. As mentioned earlier, the term “general achievement” was used in this study for referring to a general proficiency level as assessed by the average of all test grades (reading, writing, listening, speaking, and grammar) that students received throughout two semesters. The
term “speaking proficiency”, on the other hand, was used in reference to the average of students’ speaking test grades during the same period.

Initially, a total of 87 students (group A) from the B level (preintermediate) of the program at PSEU was used for statistical analyses. Then, the same analyses were carried out with the 28 students (group B) who had been administered the oral interviews.

Correlation coefficients calculated for group A indicated that the introverted subjects’ scores on the MPI correlated positively but not significantly with general achievement scores. However, when the introverted and extroverted subjects mean oral proficiency scores were compared with respect to their general achievement scores, a significant difference was found ($t=6.19; df=85; p=.001$). The result suggested that introverts tend to be more successful than extroverts in general achievement.

More significant results were obtained when the same analyses were carried out with the smaller group (group B). The non-significant correlation between introversion and general achievement found in group A, turned out to be significant at $p=.039$ level with group B. As for the difference between introverts and extroverts with respect to their general achievement scores, a t-value which was highly significant at $p=.009$ was obtained, a finding similar to the one found in group A ($p=.001$).

It should be noted that the subjects in group B were the most introverted and extroverted students who had been selected from group A specifically for the oral interviews. Thus, this finding may imply that the students who had higher introversion scores on the MPI also tended to have higher scores in general achievement.
As for the relationship between introversion-extroversion and speaking proficiency, no significant correlations were found in any of the sample groups except that the positive but rather weak correlation ($r=.133$) between extroversion and speaking proficiency found in group A tended to be closer to significance in group B ($r=.478$; $p=.084$). However, when introverts and extroverts in both groups were compared for significant differences in speaking proficiency scores, no significant differences could be found. Although the tendency towards significant correlation in group B may suggest a relationship between higher levels of extroversion and speaking proficiency (since the subjects in group B had higher extroversion scores on the MPI), it would be misleading to draw conclusions and generalizations based on these non-significant results.

From these findings it may be concluded that general achievement is related to the personality traits of introversion-extroversion. Introverts seem to achieve higher proficiency levels when compared to extroverts. This can be interpreted as evidence in favor of the claim by Eysenck (1957, cited in Skehan, 1989) that there is a relationship between introversion-extroversion and academic achievement. It seems plausible that the findings of most research studies that introversion is an advantage for higher academic achievement, especially for adult learners, (Anthony, 1973; Entwistle & Entwistle, 1970; Elliot, 1972) may also be applicable to second language learning.

The lack of relationship between introversion-extroversion and speaking proficiency which was assessed using the speaking tests conducted at PSEU appears to support the overall lack of such relationships based on the oral interviews. Thus, it can be
concluded that there is no relationship between introversion-extroversion and overall oral proficiency as assessed either by the oral interviews administered by the researcher or the speaking tests administered by the testing unit of PSEU.

Limitations of the study

The findings of the study should be interpreted in the light of several potential limitations. First, the statistical analyses were based on a sample size smaller than is normally desired. The results of statistical analyses would have been more reliable, especially for the subjects who participated in oral interviews, if a larger sample size had been used and longer time had been allotted for the data collection procedures. Furthermore, the sample population addressed in the study was limited to that of students at PSEU. This raises the question of generalizibility of findings to all university students at preparatory schools in Turkey.

Another possible limitation of the study is that there were not enough students who had very high and low scores on the MPI. In other words the students who had been classified as introverts and extroverts based on their scores on the MPI were not very strongly introverted or extroverted. It might be possible to find students with more extreme introversion-extroversion scores if a larger pool of students had been used for selecting the subjects and, as a result, more significant results might have been obtained for subjects who were more introverted and extroverted.
In evaluating the findings of the study, concerns regarding the assessment of personality through a self-report instrument should also be taken into consideration. It is possible that some students might have been biased in their responses to the questionnaire simply because of tendencies to answer positively rather than negatively. If answers to particular items can be construed by respondents as 'the desirable answer', then some students will provide this response although it may not be true. Therefore, more reliable results could have been obtained if introversion-extroversion had been measured as well through some sort of observation techniques rather than merely relying on students’ answers on a self-report instrument.

An additional limitation of the study might be related to the subjective nature of evaluating oral proficiency. Even with careful training of the judges, some factors other than speaking ability (such as, pleasantness of vocal tone, quickness of response, the topic being talked about, etc.) may interfere with the results. Although it was attempted to exclude these factors from the present study, there is still the possibility that the judges might have been biased in their judgments due to some personal ‘hidden criteria’ other than those provided by the researcher. Perhaps, a third judge might be helpful in improving the reliability of the scoring task.

Implications for further research

This study dealt with the relationship between the personality traits of introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency in second language. Due to some
limitations encountered in the study, the researcher hesitates to draw strong conclusions and generalize the findings to a larger population in Turkey. Therefore, further research should be conducted using a larger and randomly-selected sample of students in order to ensure greater reliability and generalizibility of the findings. Research can also be carried out using samples from different age ranges since there may be differences, for instance, between university and secondary school students. In addition, the gender variable which was not included in the present study might be analyzed in further studies. Furthermore, research focusing on introversion-extroversion along with some other personality variables such as risk-taking, self-esteem, tolerance for ambiguity, and sociability might explore the possible interaction between these variables and how they relate to oral proficiency in second language learning. This study primarily dealt with the relationship between introversion-extroversion and oral proficiency. Further research might explore relationships between introversion-extroversion and other skills, namely listening, reading, and writing.

This research study and others reviewed in the review of literature section support the fact that there is no simple relationship between grossly measured personality variables and grossly measured language proficiency. It is suggested that finer measures and more subtle analyses are required to tease out relationships between such very complex variables as language proficiency and personality.
Pedagogical implications

Many language teachers, as well as learners, seem to hold the view that the personality traits of introversion-extroversion are important factors contributing to success or failure in second language learning. In general there appears to be a common stereotype among language teachers that extroverts do better than introverts especially when communicative language teaching is concerned. Thus, while extroversion is regarded as an asset for second language learning, introversion is usually treated as a problem and discouraged in the classroom (Brown, 1973).

This study suggests that introverts and extroverts are likely to do equally well in a communicative language teaching situation, therefore any preconceived notion that introverts would not be as successful as extroverts on a particular kind of instruction or skill area might be misleading. The opposite case is also true. For example, extroverts might obtain as much profit from individualized study as introverts would do. One implication of this study is that existing stereotypes concerning introversion-extroversion as well as other personality factors may not apply to second language learning. Teachers, for their part, can be sensitized to the fact that the good and the bad learner, with predetermined overall characteristics does not really exist. Both introverts and extroverts may have positive and negative features and different approaches to learning a second language that need to be taken into consideration. Further research targeting on better understanding of these different approaches may provide useful insights for greater success in second language learning.
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Dear Student,

I am a student in the MA TEFL program in Bilkent University. I am doing research in order to investigate the relationship between certain personality traits and proficiency in speaking skills. I would like to have your assistance by providing me answers to the following questions. This information will help me as well as other teachers to understand second language learning better and, in this way, we will be able to help you more.

The information you provide will be strictly confidential. Your names will not be mentioned anywhere and it will not affect your grades at school. Thank you for your help and cooperation.

Emil E. Atbaş  
MA TEFL Program  
Bilkent University  
Bilkent / Ankara

Please answer the questions below by writing in the spaces provided or by TICKING the box □ that is most applicable to you.

1- Name and surname: ______________________________

2- Age: ______________________________

3- Sex: □ Male □ Female

4- Your faculty or department: ______________________________

5- What is your father’s job?  
________________________________________

6- What is your mother’s job?  
________________________________________
7- What is your parents’ level of education?

Mother

☐ University and above
☐ High school
☐ Junior high school
☐ Primary school
☐ Other (please specify)...

Father

☐ University and above
☐ High school
☐ Junior high school
☐ Primary school
☐ Other (please specify)...

8- Have you lived in a foreign country?

YES ☐ NO ☐

Where? ________________________________

How long? ________________________________

9- Do any of your family members speak English?

YES ☐ NO ☐

If your answer is YES to the above question, how do you benefit from them?

☐ I have the chance to practice with them.
☐ I ask them about anything I have difficulty in understanding.
☐ They do my assignments.
☐ I do not benefit from them at all.

10- How many years have you studied English in school?

for __________________ years / (since ____________)

11- What kind of a high school did you graduate from?

☐ State high school
☐ Vocational high school
☐ Anatolian high school
☐ Private school
☐ Other (please specify) ________________________________
12- Approximately how many hours of English a week did you have during junior high school?
   - None
   - 1-3 hours
   - 3-6 hours
   - more than 6 hours

13- Approximately how many hours of English a week did you have during high school?
   - None
   - 1-3 hours
   - 3-6 hours
   - more than 6 hours
The Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI)

Please answer the questions below by ticking either YES □ or NO □.
Do not skip any items, even if you cannot decide. If you feel you are completely neutral, you can put a question mark (?) beside the question. Try to answer the questions based on your first impression and move quickly through all twenty-four items.

1. Are you inclined to keep in the background on social occasions? □ □
2. Is it difficult for you to lose yourself even at a lively party? □ □
3. Are you inclined to be overconscientious? □ □
4. Do you like to mix socially with people? □ □
5. Are you inclined to limit your acquaintances to a select few? □ □
6. Are you inclined to be quick and sure in your actions? □ □
7. Do you ever take your work as if it were a matter of life or death? □ □
8. Do you like to have many social engagements? □ □
9. Do you generally prefer to take the lead in group activities? □ □
10. Are you inclined to be shy in the presence of the opposite sex? □ □
11. Do you nearly always have a ‘ready answer’ for remarks directed at you? □ □
12. Would you rate yourself as a happy-go-lucky individual? □ □

13. Are you inclined to keep quiet when out in a social group? □ □

14. Can you usually let yourself go and have a hilariously good time at a gay party? □ □

15. Do you like work that requires considerable attention? □ □

16. Would you rate yourself as a lively individual? □ □

17. Would you be very unhappy if you were prevented from making numerous social contacts? □ □

18. Are you happiest when you get involved in some project that calls for rapid action? □ □

19. Are you inclined to take your work casually, that is, as a matter of course? □ □

20. Do other people regard you as a lively individual? □ □

21. Do you usually take the initiative in making new friends? □ □

22. Would you rate yourself as a talkative individual? □ □

23. Do you like to play pranks upon others? □ □

24. Do you prefer action to planning action? □ □
Sevgili öğrenciler,


Emil E Atbaş
MA TEFL
Bilkent Üniversitesi
Bilkent / Ankara

Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları boşlukları doldurarak ya da kutuları işaretleyerek □ yanıtlayınız.

1- Adınız, soyadınız: ________________________________

2- Yaşınız: ________________________________

3- Cinsiyetiniz: □ Bayan □ Erkek

4- Kayıtlı olduğunuz fakülte veya bölüm:

______________________________________________

5- Babanızın mesleği nedir?

______________________________________________

6- Annenizin mesleği nedir?

______________________________________________
7- Anne-babanızın eğitim durumu nedir?

Anne
- □ Üniversite ve üstü
- □ Lise
- □ Ortaokul
- □ İlkokul
- □ Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz) ..........

Baba
- □ Üniversite ve üstü
- □ Lise
- □ Ortaokul
- □ İlkokul
- □ Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz) ..........

8- Yabancı bir ülkede yaşadınız mı?

Evet □ Hayır □

Nerede? ________________________________________

Ne kadar süre? ________________________________________

9- Ailenizde İngilizce bilen varmı?

Evet □ Hayır □

Eğer yukarıdaki soruya “EVET” dediyseniz, onlardan nasıl yararlanıyorsunuz?
- □ Onlarla pratik yapma olanağı buluyorum.
- □ Anlamakta güçlük çektiğim herşeyi sorabiliyorum.
- □ Ödevlerimi yapabiliyorum.
- □ Onlardan hiç yararlanamıyorum.

10- Kaç yıldır İngilizce öğreniyorsunuz?

............................................ yıldır/ (............................ senesinden beri)

11- Ne tür bir liseden mezun oldunuz?

- □ Devlet lisesi
- □ Meslek lisesi
- □ Anadolu lisesi
- □ Özel lise
- □ Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz) .............................................
12- Ortaokulda iken haftada kaç saat İngilizce dersi aldınız?
   □ Hiç
   □ 1-3 saat
   □ 3-6 saat
   □ 6 saattien fazla

13- Lisede iken haftada kaç saat İngilizce dersi aldınız?
   □ Hiç
   □ 1-3 saat
   □ 3-6 saat
   □ 6 saattien fazla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soru</th>
<th>EVET</th>
<th>Hayır</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Düğün, davet, tören ve benzeri özel toplantıarda arka plana çekilmek eğiliminde misiniz?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Çok canlı ve eğlenceli geçen bir partide bile kendinizi kaybetmeniz çok zor mudur?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yaptığınız işler için fazlaca çaba ve özen gösterme eğiliminde misiniz?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. İnsanlarla kaynaşmaktan hoşlanır misiniz?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tanıdıklarıınız seçtiğiniz az sayıda kişiyle sınırlandırma eğiliminde misiniz?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Genellikle işlerinizi hızlı ve kendinizden emin bir şekilde yapma eğiliminde misiniz?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Yaptığınız bir işi ölüm-kalım meselesi olarak değerlendirdiğiniz olur mu?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Çok sayıda sosyal ilişki kurmaktan hoşlanır misiniz?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Genellikle bir grup içinde başı çeken siz mi olursunuz?

10. Karşı cinsle birlikte bulunduğuuz ortamlarda utangaç mı olursunuz?

11. İnsanlar sizinle konuşurken, hemen hemen daima verilecek ‘hazır bir cevabınız’ olur mu?

12. Kendiniz için gamsız, tasasız bir kimse diyebilir misiniz?

13. Eğlenmek ya da gezmek için topluca dışarı çıktığınızda sessiz kalmayı mı tercih edersiniz?

14. Neşeli ve haraketli bir eğlencede genellikle kendiizi bırakır, eğlencenin zevkini çıkarabilir misiniz?

15. Genellikle, yoğun dikkat gerektiren işleri mi yeğlersiniz?

16. Kendinizi canlı, hayat dolu bir kişi olarak değerlendirir misiniz?

17. Çeşitli sosyal ilişkilerde bulunmanız engellenseydi çok mutsuz mu olurduğunuz?

18. Hemen eyleme geçilmesini gerektiren bazı projelere katıldığınız zaman kendiizi daha mutlu mu hissedersiniz?

19. Genellikle işlerinizi pek fazla üzerinde durmadan mı yaparsınız?

20. Başkaları sizi hayat dolu bir insan olarak mı değerlendirir?
21. Yeni dostlar edinirken, ilk adımı genellikle sizi atarsınız? □ □

22. Kendizi konuşkan bir kişi olarak değerlendirir misiniz? □ □

23. Başka insanlara muziplik ve şakalar yapmaktan hoşlanır mısınız? □ □

24. Bir şeyleri planlamaktan çok yapmayı mı tercih edersiniz? □ □
| Overall impression is of someone who communicates almost as effectively and accurately as a native speaker of English in terms of fluency, grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Needs no assistance. Needs no effort on the part of the listener. | 6 |
| Overall impression is of someone who communicates quite well, with very few inaccuracies in grammar, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Can maintain a flow of speech with almost no assistance. Needs almost no effort on the part of the listener. | 5 |
| Overall impression is of someone who communicates generally well, with few inaccuracies in grammar, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Inaccuracies in speech do not hinder the communication of a message. Can maintain a flow of speech with little assistance. Needs very little effort on the part of the listener. | 4 |
| Overall impression is of someone who is able to communicate, although with some inaccuracies in grammar, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Needs some assistance but can generally maintain a flow of speech in a variety of basic communicative tasks and situations. Needs little effort on the part of the listener. | 3 |
| Overall impression is of someone who has problems in communication and produces frequent inaccuracies in grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, and fluency. Has difficulty in maintaining a flow of speech. Needs considerable effort on the part of the listener. | 2 |
| Overall impression is of someone who has serious problems in communication. The message can be communicated with great difficulty due to constant inaccuracies in pronunciation, fluency, grammar, and vocabulary. The speaker is almost unintelligible. | 1 |
### APPENDIX D

Criteria for the Analytic Scoring of Oral Proficiency

#### PRONUNCIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Native-like pronunciation with few traces of foreign accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Always intelligible, though a definite foreign accent is conspicuous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marked foreign accent and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreign accent and pronunciation problems require concentrated listening and occasionally lead to misunderstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Difficult to understand because of frequent errors and a very heavy accent, requires frequent repetition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pronunciation problems so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FLUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Speech is as fluent and effortless as that of a native speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speech is effortless and smooth; speed and evenness of speech are slightly affected by language problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speech is occasionally hesitant with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping for words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Speech is very slow and uneven except for short routine sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Very few noticeable errors of grammar or word order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Few errors of grammar or word order, with no patterns of failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns which do not, however, obscure meaning and cause misunderstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequent errors of grammar or word order showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Errors in grammar and word order are so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VOCABULARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Use of vocabulary and idioms is close to that of a native speaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use of vocabulary seems to be adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Occasional use of inappropriate terms or words. Sentences are sometimes rephrased due to lexical inadequacies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frequent use of wrong words; conversation is somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Misuse of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vocabulary limitations so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>