

# **Personality types as predictors of oral fluency**

**By:**

**Prof Dr. Awatef Ali Sheir**  
Professor of  
Curriculum & Instruction of English,  
Institute of Educational Studies,  
Cairo University.

**Rajaa Hassan Abdallah**  
PhD student in TEFL  
University of Cairo

**Dr. Abdel Rehim Saad el Din El –  
Hilaly**  
Professor of Curriculum  
Instruction of English, Faculty of Education  
Al Azhar University.

## Personality types as predictors of oral fluency

---

## Personality types as predictors of oral fluency

**Dr. Awatef Ali Sheir, Rajaa Hassan Abdallah,  
Dr. Abdel Rehim Saad el Din El – Hilaly**

### **Introduction**

FL oral proficiency is a priority for EFL learners who struggle to attain a successful level of fluency. For this purpose, EFL educationists focus on researching this point for solutions. Gan (2008) listed the following seven discourse features for analysis: total number of words produced by each participant, number of turns, number of initiating turns, number of responding turns, hesitation phenomenon, accuracy, and mean length of utterance. In addition, four assessment criteria were used for group oral interactions as major domains of English spoken proficiency: pronunciation and delivery, communication strategies, vocabulary and language patterns and finally ideas and organization.

With the growing emphasis on the learner and the renewed interest in the role of personality traits in the acquisition of foreign language, research proved that many studies found a relation between personality traits and foreign language proficiency. Zahibi (2011) and Fazeli (2011) proved a significant relationship between personality traits and FL proficiency as well as achievement scores. The personality trait of extraversion - introversion is one of the significant factors which has been claimed to influence the learners' oral performance according to Ahmadian & Yadgari (2011). Furthermore, Czerwionka (2009) and Gan

(2008) stated that extraverts are more likely to achieve more fluent language, while introverts are likely to have success in areas of language learning other than fluency.

### **Context of the problem:**

Speaking skill is still a challenge facing English Palestinian learners. The low level of English proficiency in general and oral fluency in particular is obvious among Palestinian learners. Oral communications are affected by a number of factors. The present study investigated the impact of personality traits on oral fluency. The researcher reviewed the previous studies investigating both extraverts and introverts' oral fluency. Results of research in this field indicated that extraverts differ in their use of CSs. They use more achievement and international strategies with higher level of oral fluency while introverts employ more reduction and conceptual strategies. Related literature revealed that no one has studied the effect of personality traits on oral fluency in Palestine. Therefore, the present study tried to confirm the impact of personality traits on oral fluency among EFL graduates at the faculty of Education.

### **Statement of the Problem**

This study attempted to explore the possible correlation between extraversion- introversion and oral fluency among Palestinians EFL learners at the Faculty of Education in Palestine.

### **Questions of the study**

1. Are there significant differences between the scores of the oral tasks attained by the extroverts' students and

those of introvert students in the assessment of role of CSs on oral fluency?

2. Are there significant differences between the scores of the oral tasks attained by the extroverts' students and those of introvert students in the frequency of strategy use, amount of talk and rate of speech?

### **Literature review**

Literature review condenses the following main venues followed by research on each one: oral fluency, measuring oral fluency, personality traits, measurements of personality, and extraversion- introversion and oral fluency

### **Oral Fluency**

Although languages share many characteristics, there are differences between the native language and the foreign language. These differences result in more errors in foreign language production more than those in the first language. Khan (2010) attributed them to the following reasons: First, the limited knowledge of second language compared to the learners' broad knowledge of L1 and its lexical and grammatical items. Second, the lower degree of automatic information processing as the speaker has to pay more attention to grammatical and phonological encoding phases. Third, the existence of L1 presence accidentally or intentionally as a result of mother tongue influence or the incomplete knowledge of L2.

The acquisition of adequate oral communicative competence in a foreign language constitutes one of the European educational systems' main challenges for this new century. Nevertheless, according to Pineiro (2002), a

widespread worry exists that, despite the relevance given nowadays to the fact of being fluent in more than one European Community language, students do not achieve satisfactory levels of competence in foreign languages at the completion of compulsory education.

Speaking a foreign language means talking smoothly, quickly and without hesitation. Binder et al. (2002) explained this concept referring to authors who used two sets of vocabulary to describe fluent speakers with others who find difficulties to speak the foreign language. The first list refers to smooth, fluid, rhythmic and having a good cadence. The second list includes the following: jerky, hesitant, choppy, containing extended pauses, and lacking appropriate phrasing. As stated by Bhat et al. (2010:1), oral fluency is an important feature of speech which is considered a benchmark of evaluation of a person's proficiency in a language. According to him, the term fluency is used in two senses. In the broad sense, fluency seems to mean global oral proficiency and in the narrow sense, it is the "rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language under the temporal constraints or on-line processing.

Researchers have tried to investigate fluency and factors affecting its level through a large amount of experimental research in different countries. For example, Pineiro (2002) carried out a study to know the levels of English language oral comprehension and expression achieved by the students of this community, and to find out

possible factors influencing such levels of achievement. Results revealed that they got higher scores in the oral comprehension test than in the oral expression one.

Kormos & Dénes (2002) investigated the differences between fluent and non-fluent L2 learners as well as the relationship of native and non-native teachers' perceptions of fluency and temporal and linguistic variables. The results indicated that fluency is best conceived of as fast, smooth and accurate performance. They considered fluency as a temporal phenomenon and can also be characterized by pace as it also includes stress, and it is easy to be calculated.

In a recent study, Préfontain (2010) assessed second language fluency using three elicitation tasks among nine intermediate-level French students. The results of the study indicated that task difficulty impacts speech perception and production with regard to pausing, speaking duration, and number of syllables produced. The findings also provided preliminary evidence indicating a link between temporal fluency measurements and rater interpretation of holistic descriptors.

### **Measuring Fluency**

Measuring fluency is an important dimension of foreign language proficiency. Three aspects of fluency have been suggested by researchers for measurement according to Jong & Wempe (2007) : breakdown of fluency which can be measured by number and length of pauses; speed and density per time unit that refers to speech rate and can be

## Personality types as predictors of oral fluency

---

measured by counting syllables; and repair fluency that can be determined by counting false starts and repetitions.

However, measurement of fluency is a point of disagreement among experts and educators who measure fluency according to different scales. Mizera (2006:37) presented these differences as follows: a) The Modern Language Association classifies fluent speakers as those who have mastered enough L2 vocabulary and grammar to speak at normal speed with reasonably good pronunciation. b) The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages describe fluent speakers as those who produce fluent speech in which errors virtually never interfere with communication or disturb the native speaker. c) The U.S. Foreign Service Institute treats fluency as a distinct component of L2 Speech and it uses a 6-point scale that identifies fluency closely with smoothness of delivery and the absence of hesitation. d) The University of Reading uses a 4-point scale for rating the fluency of ESL learners. It includes coherence, length of utterances, and the ability to use fillers skillfully. It also includes separate scales for pronunciation, vocabulary and sociolinguistic appropriateness.

Following Binder et al. (2002), the easiest way to measure fluency in most skills is to select a repeatable action such as saying a word or writing the answer to a math problem, and to count how many times a person can complete that action in a fixed period of time. For the same purpose, educationists describe fluency by identifying ranges of count per minute or second of correct responses



on specific procedures. Clear instructions are given to start and end the performance. Hincks (2004) suggested using seconds for having a number of advantages. It provides a fair comparison between speakers who use long words versus those who use short words, allows comparisons between languages with different average word length, and provides a more local measurement so that variations in speaking rate can be tracked.

Measurement of fluency has been attracting more attention in recent years and many studies have been conducted to measure fluency variables. Hincks (2004) investigated eighteen oral presentations made by Swedish students of Technical English for fluency analysis. Results revealed significant correlations with the metric ratings for both males and females. Derwing et al. (2004) checked the relation of assessments of fluency in low-proficiency second language speech to temporal measures and variety of tasks. Researchers stressed the need to use a variety of tasks that draw upon different skills to enhance fluency.

In a research carried out at the Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication, Jong & Wempe (2007) described a method to measure speech rate without the need of a transcription automatically, easily and objectively. High correlations were found between speech rate calculated from human syllable counts and from automatically determined syllable counts. In an investigation conducted by García-A (2008), the influence of a given topic on rate of speech was explored. Results showed that there was a significant difference in the

response according to topic as well as a significant interaction between group and topic. Bhat et al. (2010) questioned for objective language assessment methods to rate oral fluency in a second language. They showed the existence of an alternate approach to articulation speech rate and findings had implications in developing fluency assessment systems for language-resource scarce settings.

### **Personality traits**

Personality refers to the attributes and characteristics that describe a person and influence behavior in different situations. It consists of a multitude of specific traits as anxiety, control, achievement, social competence, motivation, attitude and self esteem. Joseph (2011:37) says: "A common point of agreement from various studies is that no two individuals are absolutely identical. Personality consists of characteristics that make a person unique." This means that it is very rare to find two or three people are characterized by the same qualities in any gathering whether social or educational. According to Sharp (2008:18), individuals are characterized by a unique and basically unchanging pattern of traits, dispositions or temperaments.

In the same context, the interaction between personality traits and foreign language learning was stressed by Erton (2010:115) "One of the primary objectives in foreign language learning and teaching today is certainly learning more about the students and increasing the awareness in personal differences in the language classroom." The same point was adopted by Maeda (2010)

who stressed that successful L2 learning is due not only to teaching strategies of verbal variables , but also to other factors such as personality, psychological aspects , learning styles, learning environment, age and gender.

Therefore, it can be stated that personality is one of the individual differences that affect learning a foreign language either positively or negatively. Hajimohammadi & Mukundan (2011:162) say: "Personality is one of the individual differences which are broadly established to have an outcome on learning generally and second language acquisition especially. It sounds that personality traits have types of result on the learners' language learning." Ghapanchi et al. (2011:148) confirmed the important role that individual differences play in second language learning. In their points of view, individual differences include factors such as personality, language aptitude, motivation, anxiety, attitude and learning styles. In brief, researchers handled the relationship between personality and learning a foreign language and stressed their impact on each other.

### **Measurements of Personality Traits**

Special standards are needed for identifying the type of each character. For this task, Sharp (2008:18) mentioned three different measures of personality that have been used largely in L2 research: the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), the Five Factor Model (FFM) and Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ). For more clarification, Ghapanchi et al. (2011:149) presented the three measurements indicating their designers and the year of

their existence: "There are different measures of personality. Three of them that have been used largely in L2 research are the Myers Briggs Type Indicator, (MBTI) (Myers and Briggs, 1976) Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, (EPQ) (Eysenck, 1975), and the Five Factor Model, (FFM) (Costa and McCrae, 1992)."

For the components of the first measurement, Sharp (2008) summarized its main features in the following: Extroversion–Introversion, Sensing – Intuition, Thinking – Feeling, and Judging - Perceiving. The second measure has become a standard in psychology according to O'Connor & Paunonen,(2007) and Mairesse (2007). It refers to five broad domains that are used to describe human personality: neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. The third is the most widely used in research on personality and is considered to be superior to the Big Five factors by some researchers for being stable across time and situation. It is used to measure three super traits of personality: Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism.

### **Extraversion-Introversion and oral fluency**

Extraversion – introversion dimension is the core of recent research on personality attributes to foreign language acquisition. Tracking the related literature showed that it had attracted the attention of many researchers during the recent decades. According to Daele (2005:92), the personality attribute that has received most attention in second language acquisition research is extraversion. Gan (2011:1260) confirmed this point saying: "The aspect of

personality that has received most attention in second language pedagogy research is extroversion and introversion, which results from personality theories developed in the field of psychology."

Three basic characteristics of extraversion make it important as demonstrated by Wilt & Revelle (2008). First, extraversion has emerged as one of the fundamental dimensions of personality. It has the potential to explain the covariation of a wide variety of behaviors. Second, extraversion predicts effective functioning and well being across a wide variety of domains from cognitive performance. Third, extraversion predicts risk and also resilience for different forms of psychopathology. With regard to this dimension, any person can be described as extraverted or introverted. Karbalaei, (2008:19) differentiates between the two characters in the following comparison: "when someone is observed to be talkative and sociable (the so-called "extrovert") he or she can be described as "expressive". In contrast, people who are more quiet and private (the so-called "introvert") can be described as "reserved"."

Ahmadian, et al. (2011:4) considered extraversion – introversion as a continuum which shows one's degree of outgoingness. A typical extravert is a person who tends to be sociable, needs people to talk to, is easy-going and optimistic, while a typical introvert is quiet, reserved, plans ahead, and dislikes excitement. According to them, many classroom teachers believe that in second or foreign language learning, extraverts are more successful than

introverts, particularly in their communicative ability. Zafar & Meenakshi (2012) described extroverts as characters tend to be gregarious, sociable, like parties, lively, need excitement and active towards the external world, while the introverts tend to be private, quiet, have few friends, avoid excitement and meeting others, and directed inward. However, they stressed that extroversion and introversion are used to gauge two styles and everyone is extroverted or introverted in some degree.

For speaking any language in general, extraverted persons may sound to be more fluent as they are sociable and like to engage in groups and conversations. The effect of extraversion appears while speaking either the first language or the second language as reported by researchers. This assumption was verified by investigating the relationship between extraversion-introversion and second language acquisition. Following the findings of research, Zafar & Meenakshi (2012) stated that extroverts seem to take full advantage of language-use opportunities as they tend to be sociable, and are more likely to join groups, more inclined to engage in conversations both inside and outside the classroom. Therefore, the extraverts' rate of speech is described to be higher than introverts as speakers. Zafar & Meenakshi (2012:35) support this assumption: "Since extroversion is considered to be stable personality variable, its effect should appear in both L1 and L2 languages. Furthermore, extroverts are believed to be prone to risk-taking and are likely to try out a larger amount and

variety of word types and grammatical structures at a higher speech rate."

In comparing extraverts with introverts with regard to English language proficiency, Pazouki & Rastegar (2009:80) considered extraverts to be successful language learners and there is a strong positive correlation between extraversion and linguistic abilities. They attributed this assumption to the differences between the two categories as summarized by Eysneck as follows: a) Reward enhances the performance of extraverts more than introverts, whereas punishment impairs the performance of introverts more than extraverts. b) Introverts are more susceptible to distraction than extraverts. c) Introverts take longer than extraverts to retrieve information from long term or permanent storage, especially non-dominant information. d) Extraverts show better retention test performance than introverts at short retention intervals, but the opposite happens at long retention intervals. This apparent strong positive correlation between extraversion and achievement of FL proficiency was indicated by most researchers: Wilt & Revelle(2008), Zafar & Meenakshi (2012), Sharp (2008), Pazouki & Rastegar (2009), Karbalaei (2008), Daele (2005), Ghapanchi et al. (2011). They believe that extraverts are better language learners than introverts especially in oral skills.

For the growing interest of the effect of personality on FL production, much research has been achieved to discover this relationship. Ahmadian et al. (2011) reported that studies on EXT/INT dimension of personality factors

were initially introduced in (1933) by Carl G. Jung. However, the relationship between personality and FL learning has been a matter of controversy till now according to Zafar & Meenakshi (2012). Most of these studies revealed a positive relation between degree of extroversion and various measures of L1 fluency. On the other hand, some studies indicated that introversion or extroversion do not have a significant impact on second language learning in the classroom.

Review of previous studies in this area starts with an effort has been done recently by Ahmadian, et al. (2011) to investigate the relationship between extraversion/introversion personality dimension and oral communication. The results revealed that extravert participants used interactional strategies significantly more than introvert ones whereas introvert participants used conceptual strategies significantly more than extravert ones. At the same time, another investigation was achieved by Naveh, et al. (2011) for the same purpose. The findings revealed a significant and positive correlation between extroversion tendency and four categories of vocabulary learning strategies as well as overall strategy use. Kaivanpanah & Yamouty (2009) also examined the impact of language proficiency and extraversion/introversion on the use of communication strategies. Findings revealed that teaching circumlocution, appeal for help, and time-stalling devices are pedagogically effective for both personalities.

In earlier studies, Gan (2008) aimed to find the correlation between degree of extraversion and oral



productions in terms of accuracy, hesitation and mean length of utterance. Results revealed that the extrovert demonstrated a more active participation in the assigned assessment task, and the extrovert's speech generally demonstrated a higher level of accuracy, fluency and use of CSs. Keyvani (2001) found that extraverts were more risk-taker and used more achievement strategies while introvert students employed more reduction strategies. Wakamoto (2000) proved that introverts and extraverts were different in using social-affective and functional practice strategies.

**Critical analysis of previous research:**

Reviewing the previous studies revealed that fluency is related to speech production in both first and second languages. It is also a skill that can be taught and improved in the classroom. Furthermore, not only is fluency influenced by temporal variables, but also additional series of factors. Oral production is comprised of: speech rate, articulation rate, and silent pause phenomena. Some studies considered counting words per minutes while others dealt with seconds. Speaking fluently proved to be a difficult objective that EFL learners try to achieve, thus it keeps being a rich field for discussion and investigation in educational research. However, it seems true that giving considerable attention to all overlapping factors affecting fluency will lead to developing this skill among EFL learners.

Researchers consider extraversion as a clear sign and a good predictor of the learners' oral performance. There are signs that extraverts have personal characters enable them

from taking risks regardless of possible mistakes and this leads to more use of oral language. On the other hand, introverts seem to be shy and prefer to hide and avoid participation in oral discussions or conversations with others. This leads to the assumption that extraverts are more successful in oral performance. This comparison has become a point of controversy among researchers and it is still under discussion with regard to communicating in the foreign language. Furthermore, these differences created a solid ground for educational research aiming to check the different behavior of each personality with regard to FL oral performance.

### **Purpose of the study:**

The purpose of the study was twofold:

- a) to Identify the differences between extraverts and introverts' self reports of the importance of using communication strategies.
- b) to explore the possible correlation between students' extraversion - introversion and their use of communication strategies, amount of talk and rate of speech.

### **Hypotheses of the study:**

1. There are significant differences between the scores of the oral tasks attained by the extroverts' students and those of introvert students in the assessment of role of CSs.
2. There are significant differences between the scores of the oral tasks attained by the extroverts' students and

those of introvert students in the frequency of strategy use.

3. There are significant differences between the scores of the oral tasks attained by the extroverts' students and those of introvert students in amount of talk
4. There are significant differences between the scores of the oral tasks attained by the extroverts' students and those of introvert students in rate of speech.

**Definition of terms:**

**Personality traits:** Personality is defined in this study as the internal traits, characteristics, qualities and features of extraverts and introverts. These traits determine the participants' willingness in sharing social activities with others.

**Oral fluency:** Fluency in this study refers to the ability of speaking English as a foreign language in a given task at limited time and determining its appropriateness according to the number of words, duration of speech **and use of CSs.**

**Delimitations of the Study:**

The present study proceeded within the main following delimits:

- 1- The study was limited to the effect of the trait of extraversion – introversion on oral fluency. The personality measurement in this study used only the nineteen items relating to extraversion- introversion dimension suggested by Esyneck (EPQ)
- 2- Fluency was measured by using: amount of talk, rate of speech and use of CSs.

### **Significance of the study:**

This study was hoped to be significant for the following reasons:

1. This study may broaden the insights into the research of FL oral fluency and provide EFL educators with systematic solutions for developing its level.
2. It may serve clarifying the effect of personality traits on FL oral performance in the light of the inconsistent results of similar studies.
3. It may guide educators to deal with individual differences resulting from different personality traits.

### **Method & procedures**

#### **Participants:**

The participants of the study consisted of 36 fourth year EFL undergraduates. They ranged in age from 21 to 22 years old. All participants responded to Eysneck Personality Questionnaire to measure the degree of extraversion – introversion. Participants were placed into two groups according to their personality: extravert or introvert. As a result, the final number was 21 extraverts and 15 introverts and their gender ratio was 13 males to 23 females.

#### **Instruments of the study :**

Three instruments were used in this study. They included a strategy questionnaire, Eysneck Personality Questionnaire and an oral fluency test. Rating scales were used to measure amount of talk, rate of speech and use of communication strategies.

**First: The strategy questionnaire**

The development of the strategy questionnaire is based on Nakatani's oral communication strategy inventory (2006), Kongsom's strategy questionnaire (2009), and Yang & GAI's questionnaire of communication strategies research (2010). It consisted of 33 items of communication strategies. Students indicated to what extent they consider the role of communication strategies on developing oral fluency according to a four point scale ranging from never, rarely, sometimes to often. Students who responded with "never" meant that this strategy is not important and has no role on developing oral fluency. Students who responded with "rarely" meant that this strategy has little importance. Students who responded with "sometimes" meant that this strategy is important to some extent. Students who responded with "often" meant that this strategy is very important and its role on developing oral fluency is very obvious.

For the different strategies in the questionnaire, the items one, three, four and twenty refer to avoidance strategies. The items ten, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, seventeen, nineteen and thirty one refer to modification strategies. The items five and six refer to approximation strategy. The items seven, twenty one, thirty three and twenty eight refer to word coinage strategy. The items nine, eighteen and twenty four refer to time gaining strategy. The items eleven and twelve refer to borrowing strategy. The item sixteen refers to self repair. The items twenty two, twenty five and thirty refer to non linguistic strategy. The

items twenty three, twenty seven and thirty two refer to appeal for assistance. The items two and seven refer to circumlocution strategy. Finally, item twenty six refers to literal translation.

### **Second: Eysneck Personality Questionnaire**

Eysneck personality questionnaire, revised version (EPQ-R) was used. Implementation of this questionnaire in this study is based on using it by Marine (2005), Naveh & Soltani (2011) , and Hajimohammadi & Mukundan (2011) to measure personality traits. In fact, EPQ comprises 83 questions that represent three dimensions of personality (extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism). This study used only the 19 questions that measure extraversion-introversion. Participants ranked their answers according to yes no questions.

### **Third: Oral Fluency Test**

The construction of the communication tasks of the oral fluency test is based on El Hilaly's oral fluency test (2001), Nakatani's simulated authentic conversation tasks (2005), and Khan's three oral communication tasks (2010).The oral fluency test had three communicative tasks. Topics of the tasks included different information and daily life situations to interact during interviews.The tasks were chosen to be communicative and suitable as much as possible. Also, they provided equal opportunity for all participants. Participants were asked to talk for three minutes in each task. The scores were based on the number of words, duration of speech and number of CSs

### Reliability and validity of the instruments

The instruments were presented to a jury of EFL professors and instructors at the universities in Gaza. They were asked to test and guarantee the items' clarity, accuracy and sufficiency to measuring the variables of the study. In the light of comments and corrections, the instruments were rebuilt by the researcher. For reliability, the instruments were piloted with a number of learners of the whole population of the study. Cronbach alpha was conducted to measure internal consistency. The reliability of the coefficient of the questionnaire was .72 and the oral fluency was .81 indicating acceptable reliability.

### Statistical analyses

Participants completed the questionnaires and the oral fluency test. Comparative analysis used T- test for independent samples and Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test to find differences between extraverts and introverts. Results are introduced according to the hypotheses of the study as follows:

**Table (1) T- Test results comparing the extraverts and introverts in assessing the role of communication strategies**

Group	No.	Mean	Std. D.	df	t value	Sig.
Extraverts	21	98.3333	11.14151	34	1.947	.04
Introverts	15	90.8000	7.87582			

The above table reveals the means and standard deviations of the extraverts and introverts. The adjusted means was (98.3333) for the extraverts' group while it was (90.8000) for the introverts' group. The results of t- test show that there are significant differences between the

**Personality types as predictors of oral fluency**

---

extraverts and introverts in determining the role of CSs use as the estimated t- value (1.947) was statistically significant at.05 level.

**Table (2) T- test results comparing the extraverts and the introverts in using seven communication strategies**

strategy	extraverts		introverts		t-value	Sig.
	Mean	Std. D.	Mean	Std. D.		
Approximation	1.5429	.47809	.8667	.51640	1.653	.025
Topic avoid.	3.5238	3.31088	2.9333	3.30512	.528	.601
Borrowing	1.1905	1.12335	1.0667	1.57963	.275	.785
Appeal for as.	.8571	.57321	.4667	.51640	2.098	.043
Time gaining	22.5238	12.25814	15.4667	10.80917	1.027	.032
Self repair	1.8286	1.80476	.8667	.74322	1.135	.041
Modifications	5.9524	4.59865	5.333	4.85308	.263	.794

The above table presents differences between extraverts and introverts in using seven CSs. The results indicated that extraverts achieved better than the introverts in using the strategies of approximation, appeal for assistance, time gaining and self repair. On the other hand, the performance of the two groups was not different in using the strategies of topic avoidance, borrowing and modification. The differences regarding the four strategies were significant at 0.05.

**Table (3) Wilcoxon test results comparing the oral test means for the extraverts and introverts in the amount of talk**

Amount of talk	Introverts		Extraverts		Z	Sig.
	Mean Ra.	Sum Ran.	Mean Ra.	Sum Ran.		
	2.00	2.00	5.89	53.00	2.599	.009

The above table shows the medians and sum of ranks of the number of words in the oral test of the extraverts' and introverts' group. Results indicated significant differences  $z = (2.599)$ ,  $p = (.009)$ . The sum of ranks in favor for the extraverts' group was (53), while the mean ranks in



favor of introverts was (2). According to this result, there are significant differences between extraverts and introverts in amount of talk.

Table (4) Wilcoxon on test results comparing the oral test means for the extraverts and introverts in the rate of speech

Rate of speech	Introverts		Extraverts		Z	Sig.
	Mean Ra.	Sum Ran.	Mean Ra.	Sum Ran.		
	6.00	6.00	5.44	49.00	2.191	.028

The above table presents the medians and sum of ranks of rate of speech in the oral test of the extraverts and introverts. Results indicated a significance difference  $z = (2.191)$ ,  $p = (.028)$ . The sum of ranks in favor for the extraverts' group was (49), while the sum of ranks in favor of the introverts' group was (6). According to this result, there are significant differences between the extraverts and introverts in the rate of speech.

### Discussion

To achieve the aim of the study, the researcher prepared a list of communication strategies. Ten of these strategies were selected and introduced to the participants to rate their role in developing oral fluency. In addition, seven CSs were chosen to be the focus of oral fluency test. Results revealed that extraverts and introverts differed in rating the role of using communications strategies on developing oral fluency. Findings from the study demonstrated that there are significant differences in the use of communication strategies, amount of talk and rate of speech between extraverts and introverts.

Regarding differences between extraverts and introverts in the role of CSs on oral fluency, results showed

that extraverts consider the role of CSs on developing the oral performance by EFL learners more important than introverts. It can be concluded that there were significant differences between the two groups according to the participants' reports. This can be ascribed to extraverts' willingness to share in any communicative activity than introverts who tend to achieve their aims with less excitement.

Analysis of the oral tasks of extraverts and introverts proved also that there are differences between the two groups in amount of talk and rate of speech. Furthermore, using communication strategies is not the same by the two groups which indicated convergence in performance between extraverts and introverts. An explanation for this point may be due to shyness, anxiety or hesitation by the introverts.

The findings of this study could support a positive correlation between extraversion and oral fluency. The results showed that there is significant relationship between extraversion and oral fluency among EFL learners. Based on the findings, extraversion – introversion dimension of personality is related to EFL oral fluency. In other words, being a fluent speaker of English as a foreign language can be a sign of an extroverted character.

This result was highly expected, but it was one of the possible expectations as some previous studies got similar results. The findings of this study regarding the significant relationship between extraversion and oral fluency are in agreement with a number of studies which indicated a positive relationship between extraversion and learning a foreign language: Naveh (2011) proved a significant and

positive correlation between extroversion tendency and four categories of vocabulary learning strategies as well as overall strategy use. Gan (2008) revealed that the extrovert demonstrated a more active participation in the assigned assessment task, and the extrovert's speech generally demonstrated a higher level of accuracy, fluency and use of CSs. Ahmadian (2011) also found that extraverted participants used interactional strategies significantly more than introverted ones.

On the other hand, the results of this study are not consistent with the findings of Pazouki & Rastegar (2009) in their study to explore the relationship between extraversion-introversion, shyness, and EFL proficiency; Karbalaei (2008) in his study to explore the differences between extraverted and introverted persons; Rohani & forouzandeh (2012) in their study to investigate the relationship between personality types and English poetry comprehension. Their findings indicated that there is no significant relationship between oral fluency and personality traits. With regard to what has been mentioned concerning consistencies and discrepancies of research findings, this point of discussion received a variety of conclusions ranging from extremely negative to extremely positive.

Based on the findings, it seems that the effect of extraversion – introversion dimension of personality can appear clearly in FL communications. This interpretation should not ignore the high skills and abilities required to learn a foreign language which motivate the learners to pay all necessary efforts regardless of their personal character. Summing up, extraverts are expected to be more fluent than

introverts. Therefore, personality traits of learners can help teachers in varying their methods of teaching and learning resources.

### **Conclusions**

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. Extraversion could contribute to better achievement in oral fluency and oral language performance is directly influenced by extraversion.
2. Extraverts' group considered the role of communication strategies on developing oral fluency strategies more important than introverts did.
3. Findings of the study showed that extraverts' students are better than introverts in using the communication strategies, amount of talk and rate of speech.

### **The study highlighted the following recommendations:**

1. Oral fluency is an important outcome of learning English language and its level among EFL learners needs to be evaluated in order to provide suitable solutions.
2. Involving qualitative methods may be more indicative than quantitative methods in determining the type of character and there is a need to use other means to measure behaviors as observations and case studies
3. The degree of extraversion should not be an obstacle that hinders learning of the foreign language and attaining oral fluency. EFL educationists and experts should diversify their methodology to suit extraverts and introverts as well.

## References

- Abu Alyan, A. (2013). Oral communication problems encountering English major students: perspectives of learners and teachers in Palestinian EFL context, *Arab World English Journal AWEJ* 4(3):226-238.
- Ahmadian, M. & Yadgari, H. (2011). The Relationship between Extraversion/Introversion and the Use of Strategic Competence in Oral Referential Communication, *Arak University, Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 53(22).
- Bhat, S.; Hasegawa-J.; Mark, S. R. (2010). *Automatic Fluency Assessment by Signal-Level Measurement of Spontaneous Speech*, Department of ECE, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Center for Spoken Language Understanding, Oregon Health and Science University, USA, ISCA Archive <http://www.isca-speech.org/archive>
- Binder, C.; Haughton, E.; Bateman, B. (2002). *Fluency: Achieving True Mastery in the Learning Process*, University of Oregon.
- Czerwionka, L. (2009). Motivations and Perceptions of Participation in Spanish Second Language Classrooms: The Case of High Achieving Introverted Students, University of Texas at Austin, *TPFLE* (13)1.
- Daele, S. V. (2005). The effect of extraversion on L2 oral proficiency, Universidad Complutense de Madrid. ISSN 1576-4737. p:92 circular <http://www.ucm.es/info/circulo>.
- Derwing, T. M.; Rossiter M. J.; Munro, M. J. & Thomson R. I. (2004). Second Language Fluency: Judgments on Different Tasks, University of Alberta, *Language Learning* 54:4, , p: 655–679.
- Elhilaly, A. (2001). *The effect of communication strategies and risk taking on oral fluency* , Faculty of Education, Al Azhar University.
- Erton, İ. (2010). Relations between personality traits, language learning styles and success in foreign

- language achievement, Hacettepe University, *Journal of Education*, 38 : 115-126.
- Fazeli, S. H. (2011). *The Effect of Personality Traits on Use of the Cognitive English Language Learning Strategies*, Department of English Language Teaching, Abadan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran doi:10.5296/ijl.v4i1.1004 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i1.1004>
- Firwana, S. S. (2011). "A Comparison between Palestinian EFL Teachers' and Students' Attitudes toward Oral Errors and Their Correction", Faculty of Arts, Islamic University of Gaza, *Islamic university journal*, 19(2): 1527- 1558. ISSN 1726-6807 <http://www.iugaza.edu.ps/ar/periodical>
- Firwana, S. (2010). *Impact of Palestinian EFL teachers' attitudes toward oral errors on their students' attitudes and choice of error treatment strategies*, Phd Dissertation, Boston college.
- Gan, Z. (2011). An Investigation of Personality and L2 Oral Performance, The Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong ISSN 1798-4769 *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(6): 1259-1267.
- Gan, Z. (2008). *Extroversion and group oral performance: A mixed quantitative and discourse analysis approach*, The Hong Kong Institute of Education , 32(3).
- García-A, L. (2008). The effect of topic on rate of speech, Indiana University, *ELIA* 8, pp.117-150.
- Ghapanchi, Z.; Khajavy, G. H. & Asadpour, S. F. (2011). L2 Motivation and Personality as Predictors of the Second Language Proficiency: Role of the Big Five Traits and L2 Motivational Self System, *Canadian Social Science*, 7(6):148-155, DOI:10.3968/j.css.1923669720110706.030
- Hajimohammadi, R. & Mukundan, J. (2011). *Impact of Self-Correction on Extrovert and Introvert Students in EFL Writing Progress*, Department of Educational Studies, Faculty of Education, Universiti Putra

- Malaysia, [www.ccsenet.org/elt](http://www.ccsenet.org/elt) English Language Teaching 4(2).
- Hincks, R. (2004). *Measures and perceptions of liveliness in student oral presentation speech: A proposal for an automatic feedback mechanism*, Department of Speech, Music and Hearing The Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) SE100 44 Stockholm, Sweden, In STILL/ICALL Conference in Venice.
- John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). *The Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives*, Department of Psychology, University of California, MC 1650,., *Handbook of personality: Theory and research (2nd ed.)*. New, York: Guilford.
- Jong, N. H. & Wempe, T. (2007). Automatic measurement of speech rate in spoken Dutch, University of Amsterdam, *ACLIC Working Papers* 2(2): 51 –60 52.
- Joseph E. D. (2011). Personality traits, sex and age of inmates in Nigerian prisons, Department Of Guidance and Counselling Faculty of Education, University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria, *European Journal of Educational Studies* 3(1), ISSN 1946-6331, Ozean Publication.
- Kaivanpanah, S. & Yamouty, P. (2009). On the Role of Instruction, Language Proficiency, and Personality Traits in the Use of Communication Strategies by L2 Learners, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Tehran, *IJAL*, 12(2).
- Karbalaei, Al. (2008). Who is in Advantage: Extrovert or Introvert?, University of Mysore, south *Asian language review* vXV11I. (1).
- Keyvani, A. (2001). *The relationship between extroversion/introversion and use of communication strategies in speaking*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Al-Zahra University, Tehran, Iran.
- Khan, S. (2010). *Strategies and spoken production on three oral communication tasks : A study of high and low proficiency EFL learners*, PhD theses, Barcelona University.

- Kormos, J. & Dénes, M. (2002). *Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners*, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.
- Kongsom, T. (2009). *The effects of teaching communication strategies to Thai learners of English*, PhD thesis, University of Southampton, Faculty of Education.
- Marin, A. (2005). *Extraversion and the use of the use of vocabulary learning strategies among University EFL students in Mexico*, PhD thesis, University of Essex.
- Mizera, G. J. (2006). *Working memory and L2 oral proficiency*, University of Pittsburgh, PhD dissertation.
- Naveh, M. H.; Kafipour, R. & Soltani, R. (2011). The relationship among extraversion tendency, vocabulary learning strategies, and reading comprehension of EFL undergraduates in Kerman, *Studies in Literature and Language*, 3(2):104-110, [www.cscanada.net](http://www.cscanada.net) ISSN 1923-1563[Online [www.cscanada.org](http://www.cscanada.org)].
- Nakatani, Y. (2005). The Effects of Awareness-Raising Training on Oral Communication Strategy Use, Nakamura Gakuen Junior College 2-3-5-906 Atagohama, *The Modern Language Journal*, 89,0026-7902/05/76-91 ,1.50/0.
- Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. *Modern language journal*, 90, 151-168.
- O'Connor, M. C. & Paunonen S. V. (2007). Big Five personality predictors of post-secondary academic performance, Department of Psychology, Social Science Centre, The University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43 (pp: 971-990)
- Préfontaine, Y. (2010). *Differences in Perceived Fluency and Utterance Fluency across Speech Elicitation Tasks: A Pilot Study*, Lancaster University, Lancaster, Papers from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching.
- Pineiro, E. M. (2002). Oral communicative competence in English language at the complexion of compulsory



- education, Level of achievement and conception of Galician community students, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain, *CAUCE, Revista de Filología Didáctica*, n. 25: 533-561.
- Pazouki, M. & Rastegar, M. (2009). Extraversion-Introversion, Shyness, and EFL Proficiency, *Psychological Research*, 12 (1 & 2).
- Saucier, G. (2007). *Crucial Semantic and Linguistic Aspects of Personality*, Department of Psychology, University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1227 USA.
- Semeijn, J.; Boone, Ch.; Velden, R.; Witteloostuijn, A. (2005). Graduates' personality characteristics and labor market entry an empirical study among Dutch economics graduates, *Economics of Education Review* 24 : 67–83.
- Sharp, A. (2008). Personality and second language learning, English Department, Lingnan University, Tuen Mun, Hong Kong, China, 4 (11), [www. \*Ccsenet.org/journal.html\*](http://www.ccsenet.org/journal.html).
- Wilt, J. & Revelle, W. (2008). *Extraversion, A Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior*, Northwestern University.
- Yang D. & Gai F. (2010). Chinese Learners' Communication Strategies Research: a Case Study at Shandong Jiaotong University, *Cross-cultural Communication* 6(1).
- Zafar, S. & Meenakshi, K. (2012). A study on the relationship between extroversion-introversion and risk-taking in the context of second language acquisition, *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, January, 1(1):33-40.
- Zahibi, R. (2011). Personality in English Language Proficiency and Achievement, English Department, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran. *Continental J. Education Research* 4:1 - 6, 2011 ISSN: 2141 – 4181, *Wilolud Journals*, <http://www.wiloludjournal.com>.