

The Impact of Guided Writing Practice on Iranian Extroverted/Introverted EFL Learners' Speaking Ability at Pre-Intermediate Level

Farzaneh Safari Chaboki¹ & Davood Mashhadi Heidar^{1*}

* Correspondence:

davoodm_tarbiatmodares@yahoo.com

Department of English, Tonekabon
Branch, Islamic Azad University,
Tonekabon, Iran

Received: 19 March 2019

Revision: 17 May 2019

Accepted: 30 May 2019

Published online: 20 June 2019

Abstract

Speaking and writing are the productive skills of language and share similar components. In other words, writing and speaking are clearly related activities, but the modes of production are different. In addition, among a number of personality variables in predicting English language proficiency, extraversion/introversion has been extensively studied. This quasi-experimental study aims at exploring the impact of using guided writing practice on speaking proficiency of English as a foreign language (EFL) learners with extroverted and introverted orientation. For the purpose of the study, 60 homogenous students aged 18 to 28 were selected based on Oxford Placement Test (OPT) scores and Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) among pre-intermediate participants from Mehraeen English language institute in Rasht, Iran. They were divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group received guided writing practice and the control group was instructed based on the typical method of the institute. A series of t-test was conducted to evaluate extroverts and introverts' speaking ability with respect to their personality type. The results of posttest revealed that using guided tasks improved speaking proficiency of the learners. Also, the treatment had a significant impact on extroverted learners in comparison with introverted learners.

Keywords: guided writing, speaking proficiency, extroversion, introversion

1. Introduction

Speaking is one of the four main language skills in addition to reading, writing, and listening. As Celce-Murcia, Brinton, and Snow (2014) claim it is the means through which learners can communicate with others to achieve certain goals or to express their beliefs, intentions, hopes, and viewpoints. Speaking is a vital, yet demanding skill to be mastered by EFL learners. Developing speaking skills is of crucial importance in EFL and English as a second language (ESL) programs. One of the main concerns of most language learners in both EFL and ESL contexts is how to improve their speaking skill (Celce-Murcia et al., 2014). Also, one of main concerns of the most language teachers is how to help language learners to develop satisfying language proficiency. In this regard, speaking proficiency has received the most attention among both the language teachers and the language learners.

Since 1970, the focus of language teaching has been shifted from teaching activities and teachers to learners. Researchers became interested in investigating the role of personality factors and individual differences in language learning to ascertain why some learners are more successful than others under the same circumstances and classroom setting. Some learners are better in oral communication and speaking and, in contrast, others are good writers; while both groups experience the same strategies (Berry, 2007). Extroversion/introversion is one of the important characteristics of human beings personality. Both extroverted and introverted individuals do their general activities in different manners. Karten (2008) mentioned extroverts prefer speaking than writing and solving problems with others to reach the understanding while introverts prefer writing than talking face to face and enjoy solving problems lonely through thinking deeply or with the information given by selected people.

A good manner of teaching a target language is practicing the four primary skills of listening, reading, speaking, and writing in varying degrees and combinations (Oxford, 1990). Integration of skills can provide students with the ability to transfer ideas through collaboration, discussion, and presentation. Some researchers such as Cooper (1982), Mangelsdorf (1989), and Negm (1995) viewed speaking and writing as similar forms. They believed the same set of sentences seems to be acceptable in written or spoken language, and the mechanism is the same. Furthermore, we have the same functions in speaking and writing, and the difference lies in output; so these two skills appear very similar in some ways.

According to Harklau (2002), it is important to explore the issue of how students learn a second language through writing since, unlike oral communication, written texts allow students to reread and practice repeatedly and also lead to better structure retention. Guided writing strategy facilitates students' writing process and improves writing proficiency by providing instructional materials or relevant media. It is useful for a range of teaching purposes. Consequently, the current researchers are interested in investigating the impact of using guided writing tasks as an innovative approach on learners' speaking improvement with regard to introversion or extroversion personality trait.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

A number of language theoreticians assume that speaking and writing develop mutually and directly affect each other (Myers, 1987). One reason for this assumption, as Shuy (1981) argues, is that both oral and written languages come from the same source which is one's communicative competence. The second reason is that writing and speaking are productive modes of the language arts and employ many of the same faculties. The third reason, as Magnan (1985, p. 117) notes, is that "Writing is sometimes the only possible form for speech [and] speech is the most feasible form for writing." The final reason is that writing involves talking to oneself which is considered as one of the characteristics of effective speakers. According to Jupp and Milne (1971), guided task is defined as an approach to writing composition by giving students practice with a number of different sorts of sentences which are useful in composition writing. Weissberg (2006) believes that students can improve their language skills as well as their social interaction skills through fundamental writing practice since oral and written skills share the same strategies such as topic selection and providing comments.

Personality is one of the behavioral and psychological characteristics of individuals that distinguishes one person from another and sometimes dismissed completely in research projects. Some language researchers have regarded writing as purely secondary to speaking and really just a recording system (Bloomfield, 1933), others appear to have considered written language as more representative of underlying grammar than spoken language (Chomsky, 1965). Writing and speaking are the productive skills of a language and share similar components. However, the majority of studies in the area of EFL personality have investigated the role of Extraversion-Introversion in speaking and writing separately. Therefore, the impact of guided writing practice on speaking proficiency has been neglected, and there is

few body of investigation in this area. According to Bello (1997), writing increases language acquisition because learners deal with words, sentences, and other elements of writing to convey their ideas effectively and to reinforce the grammar and vocabulary which they are learning in class.

From the above explanation, it can be assumed that writing practice can improve the students' speaking skill, so the researchers intend to investigate the impact of using guided writing tasks on Iranian extroverted/introverted EFL learners' speaking ability.

1.2 Research Questions

The following two research questions are addressed in the present study:

Q1. Does the application of guided writing practice have any significant effect on speaking proficiency of EFL learners?

Q2. Does the effect of using guided writing practice on Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability differ with being introverted or extroverted?

1.3 Research Hypotheses

According to the research questions mentioned above, the hypotheses of the study are as follows:

H1. The application of guided writing practice does not have any significant effect on speaking proficiency of EFL learners.

H2. The effect of using guided writing practice on Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability does not differ with being introverted or extroverted.

2. Review of the Literature

2.1 The Nature of Speaking

Speaking is a productive skill to communicate effectively in any language, especially when speakers are not using their native language. Language learners often think the ability to speak a language is the product of language learning; however, this skill is also an important part of the language learning process. It is worthwhile for students to know when they learn how to speak; they can use speaking to learn. Speaking is defined as an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing information. Its form and meaning are dependent on the context in which it occurs, the participants, and the purposes of speaking (Burns & Joyce, 1997).

Learning speaking in a first or other language, involves developing subtle and detailed knowledge about why, how, and when to communicate complex skills for producing and managing interaction. One of the most important aspects of everyday talk is that it always takes place in cultural and social contexts (Schmitt, 2010). Speaking in the foreign language has always been considered the most demanding skill to develop in the learners of the target language compared to such other skills as listening, reading, and writing. Chastain (1988) stated that speaking a language involves more than simply knowing the linguistic components of the message, and developing language skills requires more than grammatical comprehension and vocabulary memorization.

Speaking is the performance of the speaker's competence, but performance does not follow competence automatically. Language must first be in the head, but practice is required to enable the person who understands the language to be able to speak it. Literature on developing speaking skills in ESL/EFL suggests that oral activities should be used systematically and pushes learners to produce spoken output in a variety of appropriate genres and to provide opportunities for cooperative interaction (Nation & Newton, 2009). Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) claimed that speaking can be considered the most difficult skill to acquire because it requires the command of both listening comprehension and speech production sub-skills in unplanned situations. On the other hand, it can be viewed as the easiest skill since one can use nonverbal communication, repetition, and various other strategies to produce comprehensible utterances.

2.2 Relationship between Extraversion and Oral Proficiency

Berry (2007) believed that different performances on oral test are related to degree of extraversion within an individual. Oya, Manalo, and Greenwood (2004) investigated the relationship between the personality of Japanese students learning English and their L2 oral performance. The extraverts were more confident and able to communicate

better with their audience than introverts which resulted in their higher global impressions scores. However, extraverts were not significantly more fluent or proficient than introverts in their speech. This finding shows the positive impact of extraversion on a better way of communication but not necessarily on its accuracy.

Dewaele and Furnham (1999) claimed that extraversion is an effective factor in communicative speech production. Their assumption was that extraversion may not be a predictor of success in second or foreign language learning but it does affect L2 and FL's speech production. To this end, a formal context of the oral task was used, because it was assumed that more complexity creates more visible difference between introversion and extraversion. The findings presented that the extraverted participants were much more fluent on oral test as opposed to introverts; however, the difference was not so much visible when in their accuracy. Consequently, they explained the extraverts' superiority on oral performances: "the stress of the formal situation could cause an excessive degree of arousal in the brain of the introverts, which would overload their short term memory and affect efficient incremental processing, hence a breakdown of fluency" (Dewaele & Furnham 1999, p.535).

There are studies that reported no significant relationship between these two preferences and language proficiency. Pazouki and Rastegar (2009) made an attempt to find out any possible relationship between extraversion-introversion, shyness, and proficiency. To this end, 93 EFL students majoring English at Shahid Bahonar University in Kerman, Iran participated in the study. The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ), Stanford Shyness Inventory, and a Michigan test in English were used to measure extraversion-introversion, shyness, and English proficiency of the subjects, respectively. The results indicated that there is no significant relationship between the predicted personality traits and the students' ability of language learning.

2.3 Guided Writing

Guided writing tasks are helpful at all learning levels; they help students produce appropriate texts even with fairly limited English at the beginning level. Writing, in addition to being a communicative skill, is a skill that enables the learner to plan and rethink the communication process. It therefore provides the learner with the opportunity to focus on both linguistic accuracy and content organization. Brindley and Schneider (2002) pointed out writing instruction should evolve into a more effective set of techniques and strategies that include modeling, shared writing, guided writing, and interactive writing. Guided writing tasks prepare to facilitate students' writing process and improve writing proficiency. Williams (as cited in Celce-murcia, 2014) asserted that the nature of guided writing practice depends on the level of learners' proficiency and learning goal. In this regard, these activities include various and extensive range of writing tasks; from hand writing at beginning stages to academic writing such as essay and proposal at advanced level.

2.4 Writing vs. Speaking

Understanding the subtle differences between written and spoken discourse assists in planning instruction and overcoming the problems with traditional approaches to teaching speaking. "Spoken interaction involves producing and negotiating language rather differently from the way it is used in writing. Speakers and listeners are involved simultaneously in both producing and processing spoken interactions" (Schmitt, 2010, p.198). Emig (1977) believed that speech is interactive, it relies on the features of the immediate context of the situation, and it is generally more complicated than writing. In oral communication, speakers typically share background knowledge of the particular topic under discussion and emphasize the interpersonal relationship between the communicator and the audience (Hansen-Strain, 1989), while in written communication, the writer, as Collins (1981) explained, must explicitly communicate the desired meaning because it cannot be assumed that the reader has enough background knowledge for complete understanding without such information.

3. Methodology

3.1 Design of the Study

The current study followed a quasi-experimental design because there was no random assignment of participants. In fact, this study followed a pre-test post-test intact group design. Data analysis was performed through quantitative method.

3.2 Participants

Because of the Institute's policy and regular teaching program, it was not possible to randomize all of the participants into two groups and thus the students were required to remain intact in their regular classes during the intervention time slots. Based on the results of the Oxford Placement Test (OPT), a total of 60 learners between the ages of 18 and 28 were selected. They were asked to fill out the Persian version of Eysenck personality questionnaire (1975). Based on the scores the students obtained from EPQ, 29 extraverts and 31 introverts with their speaking tests were randomly selected for the experimental group as well as the control group to conduct the study. There were 17 introverted and 13 extroverted in the experimental group and 14 introverted and 16 extroverted in the control group. Considering their speaking proficiency, which was the main concern of the study, a sample of speaking test (interview) was employed as the pre-test and post-test of the quantitative phase of the study.

3.3 Instruments

The researchers used the following instruments for doing the objectives of this study.

3.3.1 Oxford Placement Test (OPT)

To make assured of the homogeneous sample participating in the study, OPT was administered. There are different versions of OPT. The OPT administrated in this study included 100 items, investigating vocabulary and grammar knowledge of the pre-intermediate students.

3.3.2 Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ)

Eysenck personality questionnaire (EPQ) developed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975), measures certain personality dimensions, namely extraversion-introversion (E), neuroticism (N), and Psychoticism (P). The current study focuses on E scale. EPQ is a forced choice 90-item instrument. The students were asked to fill out all 90 items during 15 minutes. No item was omitted to affect the internal consistency of EPQ.

3.3.3 Guided Writing Practice

The writing tasks consisted of different topics such as describing people, giving structure, and expressing opinions were selected from the book 'Longman Academic Writing Series' by Oshima, Hogue, and Curtis (2014) according to their level of language proficiency.

3.3.4 Speaking Test

Speaking ability can be measured in direct and indirect ways. Indirect procedures such as short talks for a certain period of time are appropriate with participants who have a limited proficiency (Farhady, Birjandi, & Jafarpour, 2000). Therefore, to achieve the purpose of the study, 5 questions from the book Longman Academic Writing Series' topics were prepared and posed to the participants of the two selected groups as pre-test and post-test. Learners were administered a pre-test before any treatment and a post-test after the treatment. They had to answer these questions orally during 15 minutes.

Answers of oral tests were taped and marked by two raters according to a rating rubric proposed by Farhady et al. (2000) in "Testing Language Skills" which considers accent, structure, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension for the evaluation of speaking. This rating scale was developed to be used with EFL speakers. Their scores were taken into 5 criteria, which were the scores of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. To obtain an interviewee's total score, the rating on each of the five scales (averaged for two interviewers) were transformed into values in the weighing table. Validity of a test is an important feature for a research instrument (Wiersma, 2000). All the items in the speaking test were reviewed by the raters as self-validation. Then the items were given to three experts to ensure the content validity of the test. The experts were asked to validate and evaluate the test by completing a checklist for validating the English speaking test. The results of the experts' evaluation of the test and the scoring rubric showed that all of the criteria used to assess the test on the five-scale indicating positive opinions of the experts. Using inter-rater reliability, the reliability of the pre-test and post-test was estimated to be .910 and .914, respectively.

3.4 Procedure

Participants of the study were from two intact classes at Mehraeen institute consisting of 60 language learners at pre-intermediate level. One of the classes was randomly selected as the experimental group and the other as the control group. A pre-test of speaking was administrated to both groups. The writing practices of the present study were

selected from the book 'Longman Academic Writing Series' by Ann Hogue (3rd edition). Both experimental and control groups were instructed for 10 sessions, in which each session lasted about 90 minutes. In current study, the comparison group was taught speaking by the typical institute class and worked on their workbook activities for about 25 to 30 minutes at the end of each session, whereas the experimental group learners were provided with different guided writing activities during the last 25 to 30 minutes at the end of each session. The guided writing tasks consisted of different writing topics and integrated instruction in paragraph organizing, sentence structure, grammar, and mechanics with the writing process. In this course, three main parts of a paragraph including topic sentence, supporting sentence (body), and concluding sentence were explained.

There are many different prewriting techniques to organize our idea into paragraph. The researchers used some techniques such as asking questions, taking note, writing in a free manner, clustering, outlining, and listing. Then some writing models with different topics were shown to the learners. Also, appropriate vocabulary and grammar points in relation to each topic were taught. In each session, a new topic was chosen by the researchers, and a sample of writing about that topic was shown to students. Then, they were asked to write a new writing; they ought to provide a new writing about a specific topic preparing what they have learned. After 10 sessions of treatment, the post-test of speaking was given to both the experimental and control groups. The students answered questions orally, and their answers were also taped and analyzed. Finally, each student received a score for both pre-test and post-test.

3.5 Data Analysis

A series of paired-samples t-tests were conducted between the pre-test and post-test speaking scores of each of the four groups to see whether there exists any significant differences within each group separately in terms of speaking ability. Then, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to assess the effectiveness of two programs in developing speaking ability for extroverted and introverted participants of both the experimental and control groups.

4. Results

4.1 The Result of the Paired-Samples T-tests

Tables 1 to 8 summarize the results of the analysis of the data for each group. Table 1 shows the results of the descriptive statistics of the extroverted learners prior to and after the treatment.

Table 1. Descriptive analysis of pretest and posttest of speaking of extroverted learners in the experimental group

| GROUPS | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|------------|------|----|----------------|
| PRE EXTRO | 12 | 13 | 1.55 |
| POST EXTRO | 16 | | 1.02 |

The descriptive statistics show that the mean value of the extroverted learners in the experimental group on the pre-test measure of speaking is 12 with a standard deviation of 1.55. However, the mean value of these learners in the post-test is higher than their pre-test scores (Mean=16, SD=1.02). Table 2 presents the results of the paired-samples t-test for the extroverted learners in the experimental group.

Table 2. Paired-samples t-test for the extroverted learners in the experimental group

| | Paired Differences | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|-------|----|-----------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Paired1 Experimental Group | | | | | | |
| Pre-test-Post-test | 4 | 1.13 | .1877 | 15.01 | 12 | .000 |

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the intervention on extroverted students' scores in the experimental group on the speaking measure. There was a statistically significant increase in speaking scores from pre-test to post-test, $t(12) = 15.01$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed). Table 3 displays the results of the descriptive statistics of the introverted learners prior to and after the treatment.

Table 3. Descriptive analysis of pre-test and post-test of speaking of introverted learners in the experimental group

| GROUPS | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|------------|-------|----|----------------|
| PRE INTRO | 12.25 | 17 | 1.36 |
| POST INTRO | 14.50 | | 1.20 |

The data reveal that the mean value of the introverted learners in the experimental group on the pre-test measure of speaking is 12.25 with a standard deviation of 1.36. Yet, the mean value for the introverted learners in the post-test is higher than their pre-test scores (Mean=14.50, SD= 1.20). Table 4 presents the results of the paired-samples t-test for the introvert learners in the experimental group.

Table 4. Paired-samples t-test for the introverted learners in the experimental group

| | Paired Differences | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|------|----|-----------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Paired1 Experimental Group | | | | | | |
| Pre-test-Post-test | 2.25 | 1.25 | .17728 | 4.12 | 16 | .000 |

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the intervention on introverted students' scores in the experimental group on the speaking measure. There was a statistically significant increase in speaking scores from pre-test to post-test, $t(16) = 4.12$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed). Table 5 displays the results of the descriptive statistics of the extroverted learners in the control group prior to and after the traditional instruction.

Table 5. Descriptive analysis of pre-test and post-test of speaking of extroverted learners in the control group

| GROUPS | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|------------|-------|----|----------------|
| PRE EXTRO | 12 | 16 | 2.02 |
| POST EXTRO | 13.20 | | 1.20 |

The extroverted learners had the mean value of 12 for the speaking before the instruction. Their mean value was 13.20 for the extroverted learners in the control group after the instruction. This indicates that in comparison to their mean values for speaking prior to the experiment, there was a little bit change in their performance on the speaking test after the instruction.

Table 6. Paired-samples t-test for the extroverted learners in the control group

| | Paired Differences | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|------|----|-----------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Paired1 Control Group | | | | | | |
| Pre-test-Post-test | 1.20 | 1.89 | .25025 | 1.78 | 15 | .004 |

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the traditional instruction on extroverted students' speaking scores in the control group. There was a statistically significant increase in speaking scores from pre-test to post-test, $t(15) = 1.78$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed). Table 7 displays the results of the descriptive statistics of the pre-test and post-test for the extroverted learners in the control group.

Table 7. Descriptive analysis of pre-test and post-test of speaking of introverted learners in the control group

| GROUPS | Mean | N | Std. Deviation |
|------------|-------|----|----------------|
| PRE INTRO | 12 | 14 | 2.12 |
| POST INTRO | 12.70 | | 1.50 |

The introverted learners had the mean value of 12 for the speaking before the instruction. Their mean value was 12.70 for the introverted learners in the control group after the instruction. This indicates that in comparison to their mean values for speaking prior to the experiment, there was not so much change in their performance on the speaking test after the instruction. Table 8 presents the results of the paired-samples t-test for the introverted learners in the control group.

Table 8. Paired-samples t-test for the introverted learners in the control group

| | Paired Differences | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|------|----|-----------------|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Paired1 Control Group | | | | | | |
| Pre-test-Post-test | .70 | 1.46 | .12458 | .546 | 13 | .368 |

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to evaluate the impact of the traditional instruction on introverted students' speaking scores in the control group. There was not a statistically significant difference in speaking scores from pre-test to post-test, $t(13) = .546$, $p < .05$ (two-tailed).

4.2 The Result of Two-way ANOVA

4.2.1 Descriptive Statistics

The intent of the study was to examine the effect of guided writing on Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability in terms of extroversion and introversion as a personality factor. Before taking the main results of ANOVA in Table 10 labeled

as Tests of Between-Subjects Effects, an assumption of ANOVA needs to be checked. It is essential to check the Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances Table to see if the assumption of equality of variance has been violated.

Table 9. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

| | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-----|-----|------|
| 3.21 | 3 | 56 | .415 |

Table 9 summarizes information about the results of the Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances. In this case, the assumption has not been violated because the Sig. value is .41, which is much larger than the cut-off of .05. The main ANOVA results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Tests of between subjects-effects

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|-----------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|---------|------|---------------------|
| Corrected Model | 131.250 ^a | 3 | 43.750 | 875.221 | .000 | .958 |
| Intercept | 11343.750 | 1 | 11343.750 | 528.145 | .000 | .859 |
| Group | 93.750 | 1 | 93.750 | 104.120 | .000 | .621 |
| EX/INT | 33.750 | 1 | 33.750 | 72.452 | .000 | .542 |
| group * EX/INT | 3.750 | 1 | 3.750 | 91.526 | .000 | .566 |
| Error | 1.456 | 56 | .000 | | | |
| Total | 11475.000 | 60 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 131.250 | 59 | | | | |

a. R Squared = .84 (Adjusted R Squared = .94)

A two-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to assess the effectiveness of two programs in developing speaking ability for extroverted and introverted participants. The independent variables were the type of program (guided writing practice, traditional skill-based learning) and learners' personality factor: Extroversion/Introversion. The dependent variable was scores on the speaking posttests, administered following completion of the intervention programs (Time 2).

Preliminary checks were conducted to ensure that there was no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, homogeneity of variances, homogeneity of regression slopes, and reliable measurement of the covariate. The results indicated that there was a significant interaction effect between groups and the personality factor. $F(1, 56) = 91.526$, $p < .05$, partial eta squared = .56. Both of the main effects were statistically significant, program: $F(1, 56) = 104.120$, $p = .000$ with a large effect size of .62; Personality factor: $F(1, 56) = 72.452$, $p = .000$ with the effect size of .54. These results suggest the experimental group performed significantly better than the control group on speaking ability test. Utilizing Tukey test, it was indicated that the mean score for the experimental group was significantly different from the mean score of the control group. The findings also show that extroverted learners showed a more substantial increase in speaking ability as a result of being instructed via guided writing practice.

5. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine how guided writing tasks influence students' speaking proficiency in terms of extroversion/introversion as a personality factor. The results presented in the previous sections demonstrate that guided writing practice can influence speaking proficiency of EFL learners significantly at the pre-intermediate level. It was also found out that extroversion versus introversion has impact on speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners.

Through the results of the speaking post-test, it was revealed that students had improved significantly in terms of using correct grammatical structures and vocabulary items.

Therefore, the results of the study can encourage EFL teachers to teach intended grammatical structures through guided writing practice in order to prevent the fossilization of incorrect structures which may happen through speaking practice. The study can also inform EFL teachers about the importance of the interrelation between language skills and the significance of including writing practice in the syllabi of language teaching classes even at the pre-intermediate levels. In addition, the outcome of the current study can act as a guideline for material developers in designing English course books and emphasize the advantage of including different kinds of guided writing practice for pre-intermediate level students, paying more attention to the role of personality factors in language learning. In EFL teaching courses, the speaking skill is most dominated of all other skills. In fact, students who talk a lot and use the chances to talk would be considered as active learners and the positive attitude of teachers to such students will affect their judgment about those students' learning abilities. Therefore, the students who are silent and prefer not to talk are perceived as passive students.

The results of this research prove that extroverts are better than introverts at least in speaking skill. The results of this study are in contrast with some other theories and studies. For example, Pazouki and Rastegar (2009) showed that there is no significant relationship between the predicted personality traits and the students' ability of language learning (Gan, 2008; Kivanpanah & Yamout, 2009). On the other hand, the findings of the present study seem to be compatible with the findings of Dewaele and Furnham (1999) who claimed that extraversion is an influential factor in communicative speech production. Cook and Hurt (1983) revealed the significant relationship between learning through communicational classroom setting and extraversion tendency. Weissberg (2006) also believes that students can improve their language skills as well as their social interaction skills through fundamental writing practice since oral and written skills share the same strategies such as topic selection and providing comments. Cleland and Pickering (2006) carried out a study in which they tried to investigate the mechanisms used in writing and speaking, outcome of their study is in line with MacArthur, Graham and Fitzgerald's (2008) findings that "There is a significant connection between the sophistication of grammar or syntax in terms of density and embedding used in speech and writing" (p. 172). Also, Abdolmanafi and Seifi (2013) found out that dialog writing helped students communicate more effectively, fluently, and accurately.

In addition, a number of language theoreticians assume that speaking and writing develop mutually and directly affect each other (Myers, 1987; Rubin & Kang, 2008; Shuy, 1981). Kim (2008) stated the assumption that oral language and literacy skills can be developed simultaneously. This study contributed an attempt to investigate the impact of using writing tasks and also the role of personality factors on speaking proficiency. The findings, with emphasis on the impact of guided writing practice in respect of individual differences (extraversion/introversion) on speaking proficiency, could resolve all disagreements. It gives a clear answer to the previous mixed results in this area and increases the role of personality and integration of skills in language proficiency.

6. Conclusion

As it has been stated before, many researchers believe in similarities and differences between speaking and writing in practical aspects and theoretical aspects. It is believed that although writing and speaking are two separate skills of language with particular differences, they both belong to the classification of productive skills of language and due sharing some similar components, these two activities are related to each other but with different ways of production. Consequently, the findings of this study also demonstrated the relationship between writing and speaking in general, and it showed that extroverted learners were more successful than introverted learners in particular. Although many researchers believe in the difference between spoken and written language theoretically, this study as a practical evidence revealed that writing can be helpful for the improvement of speaking proficiency. In other words, those differences between writing and speaking have not acted as barriers in helping one to the other. Implications of this study can provide teachers, educators, students' parents, and syllabus designers a comprehensive answer to their prejudgments about the students' ability in different language skills. Besides, the implications may be applied to both male and female population of Iranian language learners at pre-intermediate level. In fact, individual differences are one of the most considerable and effective factors in process of language learning. This study indicated that learners' performance in language skills, at least in speaking, have been influenced by the level of personality.

References

- Abdolmanafi Rokni, S. J., & Seifi, A. (2013). Dialog journal writing and its effect on learners' speaking accuracy and fluency. *Study in English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 28-37. doi: [10.22158/selt.v2n1p28](https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v2n1p28)
- Bello, T. (1997). *Writing topics for adult ESL students*. Paper presented at the 31st Annual Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Convention, Orlando, FL.
- Berry, V. (2007). *Personality differences and oral test performance*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt Rinehart Winston.
- Brindley, R., & Schneider, J. J. (2002). Writing instruction or destruction: Lessons to be learned from fourth grade teachers' perspectives on teaching writing. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(4), 328-341. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053004005>
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on speaking*. Sydney: National center for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Snow, M. A. (2014). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.). National Geographic Learning.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: a guide for language teachers*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). United States of America: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Research Laboratory of Electronics Special Technical Report 11. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Cleland, A. A., & Pickering, M. J. (2006). Do writing and speaking employ the same syntactic representations? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 54(2), 185-198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.10.003>
- Collins, J. (1981). Speaking, writing, and teaching for meaning. In B. M. Kroll, & R. J. Vann (Eds.), *Exploring speaking-writing relationships* (pp. 198-214). Urbana, Ill: NCTE.
- Cook J., A., & Hurt, H. T. (1983). *The relationships among organizational communication structures and basic communication course learning outcomes*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of International Communicate Association, Dallas.
- Cooper, M. (1982). Context as vehicle: Implications in writing. In M. Mystrand (Ed.), *What writers know* (pp. 105-128). New York: Academic Press.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Furnham, A. (1999). Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning*, 49(3), 509-544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00098>
- Emig, J. (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. *College Composition and Communication*, 28(2), 122-128. doi: 10.2307/356095 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/356095>
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck personality questionnaire (Junior and Adult)*. Kent, UK: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Farhady, H., Birjandi, P., & Jafarpur, A. J. (2000). *Testing language skills: Theory to practice*. Tehran: SMAT publication
- Gan, Z. (2008). Extroversion and group oral performance: A mixed quantitative and discourse analysis approach. *Prospect* 23(3), 24-42.
- Hansen-Strain, L. (1989). Orality/literacy and group differences in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 39(4), 469-496. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1989.tb00900.x>
- Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(4), 329-350. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00091-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00091-7)

- Jupp, T. C., & Milne, J. (1971). *Guided course in English composition*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Kaivanpanah, S., & Yamouty, P. (2009). On the role of instruction, language proficiency, and personality traits in the use of communication strategies by L2 learners. *IJAL*, 12(2), 31-68. URL: <http://ijal.khu.ac.ir/article-1-51-en.html>
- Karten, T. J. (2008). *Facilitator's guide to more inclusion strategies that work!* Corwin Press Inc.
- Kim, Y. (2008). The effects of integrated language-based instruction in elementary ESL learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(3), 432-451. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25173069>
- MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (2008). *Handbook of writing research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Magnan, S. S. (1985). Teaching and testing proficiency in writing: Skills to transcend the second-language classroom. In Alice C. Omaggio (Ed.), *Proficiency, curriculum, articulation: The ties that bind* (pp. 109-196). USA: The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc.
- Mangelsdorf, K. (1989). Parallels between speaking and writing in second language acquisition. In D. M. Johnson, & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering language minority students* (pp. 134-154). New York: Longman.
- Myers, M. (1987). The shared structure of oral and written language and implications of teaching writing, reading and literature. In J. R. Squire (Ed.), *The dynamics of language learning* (pp.121-146). Urbana, IL: Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge. <https://www.worldcat.org/title/teaching-eslefl-listening-and-speaking/oclc/179814240>
- Negm, M. (1995). Speaking and writing as inter discursive modes: Prolegomenon. *Occasional Papers in the Development of English Language Education*, 21, 55-84.
- Oshima, A., Hogue, A., & Curtis, J. (2014). *Longman academic writing series. Level 3, Paragraphs to essays*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). Language learning strategies and beyond: A look at strategies in the context of styles. In S.S. Magnan (Ed.), *Shifting the instructional focus to the learner* (pp.35-55). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oya, T., Manalo, E., & Greenwood, J. (2004). The influence of personality and anxiety on the oral performance of Japanese speakers of English. *Applied cognitive psychology*, 18(7), 841-855. doi: [10.1002/acp.1063](https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1063)
- Pazouki, M., & Rastegar, M. (2009). Extraversion-introversion, shyness and EFL proficiency. *Psychological Research*, 12(1&2), 78-91. <https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=167233>
- Rubin, D. L., & Kang, O. (2008). Writing to speak: What goes on across the two-way street. In Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.), *The oral/literate connection: Perspectives on L2 speaking, writing, and other media interactions* (pp. 210-225). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). *An introduction to applied linguistics* (2nd ed.). Hodder Education, London, England, pp. 342+ix.
- Shuy, R. W. (1981). A holistic view of language. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 15(2), 101-111. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40170919>
- Weissberg, R. (2006). *Connecting speaking and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Wiersma, W. (2000). *Research methods in education: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.