



# The Impact of Extraversion on English Language Oral Proficiency (ELOP) of the ESL Students at Tertiary Level of Education in Pakistan

Mr. Rehmat Ali Yousafzai<sup>1</sup>   
Dr. Amelia Binti Abdullah<sup>2</sup> 

**Citation:** Ali, R and Binti, A. (2025). The Impact of Extraversion on English Language Oral Proficiency (ELOP) of the ESL Students at Tertiary Level of Education in Pakistan. *Colomb. Appl. Linguistic. J.*, 27(2), pp. 20-34.

**Received:** 27-May.-2024 / **Accepted:** 20-Mar.-2025

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.22193>

## Abstract

Broadly speaking, personality refers to the combination of traits that make people appear different and accordingly behave differently. Based on this psychological endowment, individuals shall either be introverts or extroverts while behaving during oral discourses. This study investigates the impact of personality on English language oral performance (ELOP), focusing on accuracy, fluency, and vocabulary. A purposive sample of 35 tertiary-level students was selected. Two personality measuring scales, i.e. Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), were used to determine the specific traits of the participants. On the basis of the score obtained, the participants were classified as introverts and extroverts. Classroom observations, guided by observational protocols, were conducted in gleaning data. To minimize researcher bias, observations were conducted collaboratively with co-researchers and their observation and further followed by validation through concerned class teachers. Thematic analysis of the collected data revealed that extraversion significantly influences ELOP.

**Keywords:** ESL students, extrovert, introvert, oral performance, personality type

<sup>1</sup> PhD Student in TESOL, University Sains Malaysia (USM- Main Campus), rehmat@student.usm.my

<sup>2</sup> Senior Lecturer in TESOL and Education Technology, School of Educational Studies, University Science Malaysia (USM-Main Campus) Malaysia. amelia@usm.my



# El impacto de la extraversión en el dominio oral del idioma inglés (ELOP) de los estudiantes de ESL en el nivel de educación terciaria en Pakistán

## Resumen

En términos generales, la personalidad se refiere a la combinación de rasgos que hacen que las personas se diferencien entre sí y, en consecuencia, se comporten de manera distinta. A partir de esta, configuración psicológica, los individuos tienden a comportarse como introvertidos o extrovertidos durante los discursos orales. El presente estudio analiza el impacto de la personalidad en el rendimiento oral en inglés (ELOP, por sus siglas en inglés), centrándose en la precisión, la fluidez y el vocabulario. Para ello, se seleccionó una muestra intencional de treinta y cinco estudiantes de nivel terciario. Se aplicaron dos instrumentos de medición de la personalidad—el Inventario de Personalidad de Eysenck (EPI) y el Indicador de Tipo Myers-Briggs (MBTI)—para determinar los rasgos específicos de los participantes. Según la puntuación obtenida, los participantes fueron clasificados en introvertidos y extrovertidos. La recolección de datos se realizó mediante observaciones en el aula, guiadas por protocolos estructurados. Para mitigar posibles sesgos del investigador, las observaciones se llevaron a cabo en colaboración con co-investigadores y fueron posteriormente validadas por los profesores de clase interesados. El análisis temático de los datos recopilados reveló que la extraversión influye significativamente en ELOP.

*Palabras clave:* Estudiantes de ESL, extrovertidos, introvertidos, rendimiento oral, tipo de personalidad

## Introduction

In the realm of second language acquisition (English in this case), speaking is the most demanding skills to be mastered ([Hedge, 2008](#); [Lennon, 1990](#); [Lazaraton, 1996](#); [Warschauer, 1996](#)), because speaking is an integrally indispensable part of everyday life ([Griffiths, 2008](#); [Levelt, Roelofs, & Meyer, 2000](#); [Luchini, 2007](#); [Shumin, 1997](#); [Tuan & Neomy, 2007](#)). Considering the significance of speaking skills, English language oral proficiency (ELOP) has consistently been regarded as one of the most important skills for the ESL/EFL learners. It cannot be overlooked in the ESL/EFL classrooms, as learners are often judged on their language knowledge, competence, and overall proficiency based on their oral communication skills ([Chuang, 2009](#)). There are many reasons for the EFL/ESL learners to achieve full command of their English language oral proficiency (ELOP) such as “to keep up rapport with others, influence people, and win or lose negotiations” ([Hedge, 2008](#), p. 261). Different oral activities in the EFL classroom are conducted to maximize the acquisition of this highly complex cognitive skill that involves several different mechanisms ([Ellis & Yuan, 2003](#); [Jianing, 2007](#)). As a result, multiple teaching modalities have been developed, and learners’ personality traits have been, and continue to be, examined as part of the ongoing quest to enhance EFL learners’ English language oral proficiency (ELOP) in the classroom.

Personality encompasses both physical attributes and inherent psychological traits that shape an individual’s behavior, thoughts, and emotions ([Fazeli, 2012](#); [Yusoff et al., 2010](#); [Sharma, 2008](#); [Ehrman & Wakamoto, 2000](#); [Oxford, 1990](#)). In this regard, the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) have been used to distinguish between extroverts and introverts based on their behavioral tendencies ([Hans Eysenck, 1967](#); [MBTI, 1998](#)). Extroverts tend to exhibit traits such as excitement, assertiveness, sociability, talkativeness, emotional expressiveness, enthusiasm, and action orientation, whereas introverts are often *characterized by demonstrating reservedness, modesty, composure, and a preference for solitude* ([Yusoff et al., 2010](#)). Research has documented the influence of these personality traits on English language learning outcomes. As such, extroverts are perceived as more adept language learners due to their ease in engaging in social interactions ([Zafar a Meenakshi, 2012](#); [Ehrman & Oxford, 1990](#)). Their communication disposition enhances their exposure to input and output, facilitating language acquisition. Moreover, [Ellis \(2008\)](#) proposed that extroverts stand out in acquiring basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) that involves everyday language use, while introverts are likely to produce accurate language, contributing to the development of cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP).

In this study, language proficiency is defined as an individual’s accurate, fluent, and effective use of vocabulary in oral discourse ([Omaggio, 1986](#)). Accuracy refers to the grammatical, sociolinguistic, semantic, and rhetorical aspects of language use, while fluency encompasses the ability to communicate orally with ease and coherence ([Genesee, 1987](#); [Harley et al., 1990](#); [Harley & Swain, 1984](#); [Swain, 1985](#)). The interplay of specific personality traits with these proportions of language proficiency becomes evident in the research literature. Several studies have suggested that individuals with introverted personalities strongly impact the second language (L2) oral proficiency ([Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012](#); [Alavinia & Sameei, 2012](#)). Introverts have been found more accurate in terms of language proficiency, which pay careful attention to linguistic details and rules. Conversely, extroverts demonstrate effective communication skills in the target language ([Alavinia & Hassanlou, 2014](#); [Leeming & Cunningham, 2012](#)).

## Literature Review

Personality traits such as extraversion and introversion have garnered considerable attention in second language acquisition (SLA) research ([Dörnyei, 2005](#)). [Eysenck and Barrett \(1985\)](#) describe extroverts as sociable, lively, and excitable individuals, whereas introverts are characterized by their tendency towards taciturnity and reclusiveness. Furthermore, [Richards and Schmidt \(2002\)](#) define an extrovert as the one whose “conscious interaction is more often directed towards other people and events than towards the person themselves” (p. 195), while an introvert is one “who tends to avoid social contact with others and is often preoccupied with his/her feelings, thoughts, and experience”. Moreover, extraversion and introversion can also be viewed from a physiological perspective. [Chamorro-Premuzic \(2007\)](#) argues that extraversion is “the psychological result of physiological differences in the reticulo-cortical system, which affects levels of motivation, emotion, and conditioning based on the inhibition or excitation

of the cerebral cortex” (p. 23). He also states that “these consistent patterns of arousability determine the extent to which an individual is extroverted or introverted. The key traits of extroversion are warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking, and positive emotions” (p. 23). Introverts, by contrast, do not take action unless they are ready and they tolerantly pay attention to a specific subject for a long stretch of time without getting distracted ([John & Srivastava, 1999](#)). [Sharp \(2003\)](#) highlights the fundamental difference between extraversion and introversion, noting that extroverts mostly gather their data out of experience, whereas introverts engender their perspectives from inner, personal factors. That is why introverts endeavor to replace noisy crowds with quiet environments ([Chamorro-Premuzic, 2007](#)). [Burruss and Lisa Kaenzig \(1999\)](#) elaborate on these distinctions, observing that while introverts are usually taciturn, uninterested in participating in social gatherings, more apt for non-group work, and tend to think and concentrate more before talking. Extroverts, on the other hand, thrive in social settings, engage in friendships with many people, tend to come up with quick responses, and try to avoid solitude. It is not clear, however, whether extraversion or introversion “helps or hinders the process of second language acquisition” ([Brown, 2000](#), p. 155) albeit there is a commonly-held belief among language teachers pointing to the issue that extroverts outperform the introverts in L2 learning, especially in terms of being superior in communicative abilities ([Spada & Tomita, 2010](#)). As [Dörnyei \(2005\)](#) notes, “Both extraversion and introversion may have positive features, depending on the particular task in question” (p. 27). He further states that “extroverts tend to be more fluent in both L1 and L2, especially in formal context with interpersonal stress” (p. 26). In contrast, introverts are more inclined towards activities like reading, writing, and drawing rather than those requiring outgoing behavior.

## Rationale of the Study

In the field of second language acquisition (SLA), a substantial body of research underscore the influence of personality type on second language learning ([Fazeli, 2011](#); [Nodoushan, 2011](#)). Several studies have specifically investigated the impact of personality type on L2 oral proficiency ([Alavinia & Hassanlou, 2014](#); [Alavinia & Sameei, 2012](#); [Alastair, 2004](#); [Kiany, 1998](#); [Busch, 1982](#)). Some of these studies have reported that extroverts tend to outperform introverts in language learning ([Pfister, 2000](#); [Wu, 2001](#)), while others have found that introverts may achieve higher levels of L2 oral proficiency ([Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012](#); [Alavinia & Sameei, 2012](#)). The present study aims to explore the extent to which personality traits influence students’ English language oral proficiency (ELOP) of students.

## Research Questions

This study is guided and being pursued on the basis of the following research questions:

1. To what extent could students’ personalities be different?
2. To what extent these differences affect the students’ oral performance in English language?
3. To what extent extroverts perform better in English language oral communication?
4. To what extent introverts perform better in English language oral communication?

## Method

This qualitative study explores the impact of personality type on the English language oral performance (ELOP) of ESL students.

### *Instruments*

This study employed personality measurement scales, specifically the EPI and MBTI, along with classroom observations for data collection ([Myers, 2007](#); [Eysenck, 1967](#)). The instruments were adapted, and both self-validation and expert validation were conducted prior data collection.

## Sample

The sample consisted of thirty-five (n=35) students from two public sector universities in Karachi, Pakistan. Among them, seventeen (n=17) enrolled in an MS program and eighteen (n=18) in a BS English program.

## Procedure

Data for this study were collected in phases. In the first phase, personality measurement scales, the EPI and MBTI were administered to identify participants with specific personality traits. Based on the scores from each scale, the participants were divided into two groups. Codes were then assigned to each participant, using the abbreviation E (for extroverts) and I (for introverts) followed by a numeral. In the second phase, classroom observations were conducted according to observational protocols.

### *Phase-I: Bifurcation of MS Participants on the basis of EPI*

Based on the responses to each item on the EPI scale, the participants (n=17) were further classified into extroverts (n=8) and introverts (n=9). [Table 1](#) presents the EPI scores of the MS participants.

**Table 1.** *Personality classification of MS Participants on EPI*

Items on the scale	Participants																
	P-1	P-2	P-3	P-4	P-5	P-6	P-7	P-8	P-9	P-10	P-11	P-12	P-13	P-14	P-15	P-16	P-17
Do you often long for excitement	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Are you usually carefree	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Do you feel shy	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Do you prefer reading	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Do you like going out a lot	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Do you like making friends	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Do you like parties	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Dou you feel nervous	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Do you feel confident	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Are you spontaneous in saying	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Dou you like quietness	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Personality Score on EPI	E	E	I	E	I	E	I	I	E	I	I	E	I	E	E	I	I

### *Phase-II: Bifurcation of MS Participants on the basis of MBTI*

The data obtained on EPI were triangulated through MBTI. [Table 2](#) shows personality classification of MS participants on MBTI:

**Table 2.** *Personality Classification of MS Participants on MBTI*

Items on the scale	Participants																
	P-1	P-2	P-3	P-4	P-5	P-6	P-7	P-8	P-9	P-10	P-11	P-12	P-13	P-14	P-15	P-16	P-17
A-Spends or B-conserve energy		B	A		B	B		B	A		B	B	B		B	A	A
A Orderly B-flexible	A		B		B	A		B	A		A		A		B	B	B
A Outgoing B-reserved		B	A		A		B	B	A		B	A		B	A		A
A Practical B imaginative		B	A		A		B	B		B	A		B		B	A	A
A Candid or B tactful		B	A		A		B	B	A		B	A		A	A	A	B
A Plan or B spontaneous	A		B	A		A		B	A		B	B	A		A		B
A like public or B privacy		B	A		A		A		A		A		A		B	A	A
A External or B reticent		B		B		B		B		B		B		B	A		B
A Just or B merciful		B		B		B		B		B	A		A		B		B
A Active B reflective		B	A		A		A		A		A		A		B	B	A
A Sensitive B easygoing	A		A		A		B	B		B	A		B		B		A
Personality score on MBTI	I	E	E	I	I	E	I	I	E	I	I	E	I	E	E	I	E

The score of MS participants (n=17) on MBTI identified 9 participants extroverts and 8 introverts. Comparative responses on EPI and MBTI showed that one participant emerged in two different categories; consequently, the participant with contradictory responses was dropped.

### Phase-III: Bifurcation of BS Participants

To determine participants enrolled in BS program were also administered EPI and MBTI. [Table 3](#) provides detail:

**Table 3.** *Personality classification BS students on EPI*

Items on the scale	Participants																	
	P-1	P-2	P-3	P-4	P-5	P-6	P-7	P-8	P-9	P-10	P-11	P-12	P-13	P-14	P-15	P-16	P-17	P-18
Do you long for excitement	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Are you usually carefree	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

Do you feel shy	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Do you prefer reading	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Do you like going out a lot	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Do you like making friends	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
Do you like parties	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Dou you feel nervous	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Do you feel confident	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Are you spontaneous	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Dou you like quietness	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Personality Score on EPI</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>

Based on the EPI scores, 9 participants were identified as extroverts and 8 as introverts. To triangulate the data obtained from the EPI, the MBTI was also administered to the participants. [Table 4](#) displays the MBTI personality scores of the BS participants.

**Table 4.** *Personality classification of BS Students on MBTI*

Items on the scale	Participants																	
	P-1	P-2	P-3	P-4	P-5	P-6	P-7	P-8	P-9	P-10	P-11	P-12	P-13	P-14	P-15	P-16	P-17	P-18
A-Spends B-conserve energy	A		B	B	A	A		B	B	A		A	A		B	B	B	A
A Orderly or B-flexible		B	A		B	B	B	A		B		B	A		A		B	B
A Outgoing or B-reserved	A		B	A	A		B	A		B	A		A		B	A	A	
A Practical B imaginative		B	B	A	A		B	A		B		A	B	B	B	B	A	A
A Candid or B tactful	A		B	A	A		B	A		B	A		A		B	A	A	A
A Plan or B spontaneous	A		A	A		B	A		B	A		B	A		A		B	B
A like public or B privacy	A		A	A		A		A		A		A	A		B	A	A	A
A External or B reticent	A		B	B	B		B	B	A		B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B
A Just or B merciful	A		B	B	B		B	B		B	A		B	B	B	B	A	A
A Active or B reflective		B	A	A	A	A		A		A		A	A		B	A	B	B
A Sensitive B easygoing		B	B	B	B	B	B	A		B	A		B	B	B	B	B	A
<b>Personality score on MBTI</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>I</b>

The score on MBTI identified 10 extroverts and 8 introverts. The participant appeared with contradictory responses on both scales was dropped.

#### Phase-IV: Teachers' Validation of MS Participants

Teachers' observations were incorporated to achieve triangulation of the data collected through personality measuring scales. [Table 5](#) provides teachers' validation of MS participants.

**Table 5.** Teachers' Validation of the MS Participants (Teacher-1)

Points to be observed	Participants																											
	P-1		P-2		P-3		P-4		P-5		P-6		P-7		P-8		P-9		P-10		P-11		P-12		P-13		P-14	
	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Take initiative in speaking	E						E			I	E			I	E		E				E				E		E	
Do the bulk of talking	E		E				E				E				E		E				E				E		E	
Speak Fluently			E			I				I	E			I	E		E		I					I				
High speech rates			E			I					E			I			E				E			I				
Producing strong vocabulary						I				I				I					I					I			E	
Speak Accurately	E					I	E			I	E			I	E				I					I	E		E	
Show confidence In speaking	E		E			I	E				E				E		E				E				E		E	
Personality Type	E		E			I	E			I	E			I	E		E			I			E		I	E		E

The observations made by class teacher identified 10 extroverts and 4 introverts. Seven participants in the above list were also registered in another course taught by a different teacher. [Table 6](#) provides the detail:

**Table 6.** Teachers' Validation of the MS Participants (Teacher-2)

Points to be observed	Participants													
	P-1		P-2		P-3		P-4		P-5		P-6		P-7	
	I		E			E	E			I	I			E
Take initiative in speaking						E	E			I	I			E
Do the bulk of talking			E			E	E							E
Speak Fluently	I		E							I	I			E
High speech rates	I		E								I			E
Producing strong vocabulary	I									I	I			
Speak Accurately	I					E	E			I	I			E
Show confidence In speaking	I		E			E	E							E
Personality Type	I		E			E	E			I	I			E

On the basis of teacher's observations, three participants were found introverts and four were identified as extroverts.



### Phase-V: Teachers' Validation of BS Participants

Concerning personality traits of BS participants, validation of the concerned class teacher was obtained. [Table 7](#) provides detail:

**Table 7.** Teachers' Validation of the BS students

Points to be observed	Participants																	
	P-1		P-2		P-3		P-4		P-5		P-6		P-7		P-8		P-9	
	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Take initiative in speaking	E					E			I	E			I	E		E		
Do the bulk of talking	E		E			E				E				E		E		
Speak Fluently			E		I				I	E			I	E				
High speech rates			E		I					E			I		E			
Producing strong vocabulary					I				I				I					
Speak Accurately	E				I	E			I	E			I			I	E	
Show confidence in speaking	E		E		I	E				E				E				
Personality Type	E		E		I		E		I		E		I		E		I	

The observations made by the teachers identified 10 extroverts and 8 introverts.

### Phase-VI: Classroom Observation of MS Participants

After determining the participants' specific traits (extroverts and introverts) based on their EPI and MBTI scores, and further validating these traits with their teachers, observations were conducted to assess the impact of personality on the students' English language oral proficiency. Oral proficiency was measured on the basis of accuracy, fluency, pronunciation, and the use of appropriate vocabulary in speaking. [Table 8](#) provides the details:

**Table 8.** Class Room observation of MS participants

Points to be observed	Participants																																	
	P-1		P-2		P-3		P-4		P-5		P-6		P-7		P-8		P-9		P-10		P-11		P-12		P-13		P-14		P-15		P-16		P-17	
	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I		
Take initiative in speaking	E					E			E			I	E		E			E				E		E							E			
Do the bulk of talking	E		E			E			E				E				E				E		E							E				
Speak Fluently	E		E		I			I	E				E		E		I					I	E					I		I				
High speech rates	E		E		I				E			I			E					E							I			E				
Producing strong vocabulary					I			I				I					I					I		E			I		I					
Speak Accurately	E				I	E		I				I	E				I					I		E			I		I					
Show confidence in speaking	E		E		I	E			E				E		E		I				E		E				I			E				
Personality Type	E		E		I		E		I		E		E		I		E				I		E		E		I		I		E			

According to the observation sheet, participants' accuracy was assessed in terms of grammatical, sociolinguistic, and semantic accuracy, as well as the appropriate use of cohesive devices. Fluency was evaluated based on the continuity of speech. The frequent use of hedges, pauses, and fillers indicated a less proficient command of language. The participants' vocabulary strength was determined by their ability to select relevant and context-specific words.

### Phase-VI: Classroom Observation of BS Participants

The same observation criteria—fluency and accuracy (further categorized into grammatical, sociolinguistic, semantic, and rhetorical accuracy), along with vocabulary use—were applied to the classroom observation of BS students. [Table 9](#) provides detail.

**Table 9.** *Class Room observation of BS Students*

Points to be observed	Participants																	
	P-1		P-2		P-3		P-4		P-5		P-6		P-7		P-8		P-9	
	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Take initiative in speaking	E						E			I	E			I	E		E	
Do the bulk of talking	E		E				E				E			E			E	
Speak Fluently			E				I			I	E			I	E			
High speech rates			E				I				E			I			E	
Producing strong vocabulary							I			I				I				
Speak Accurately	E						I	E		I	E			I	E		E	
Show confidence in speaking	E		E				I	E			E			E			E	
Personality Type	E		E				I	E		I	E			I	E		E	

### Data Analysis

Data gathered through multiple classroom observations were thematically analyzed. Each participant was assigned a unique code for the purposes of analysis: extroverts were assigned E followed by a numeral, while introverts were given codes I followed by a numeral. In an attempt to know how could personalities be different in demonstrating various linguistic elements which further accounts to the specific oral performance of the participants, the emerging themes in respect of each specific category were grouped into the following pattern themes.

#### Theme 1: Personality Factor and Grammatical Accuracy

From the analysis of data, grammatical accuracy was found as a common denominator among extroverts and introverts irrespective of gender discrimination (E, 1; I, 3; I, 5; I, 7 & E, 4).

#### Theme 2: Personality Factor and Socio-Linguistic Accuracy

In the pronunciation analysis, choice of appropriate vocabulary, context specific terms and how well the participants accommodate themselves according to the context, the data suggested the dominant role of extraversion (E, 2; E, 3; I, 7; E, 9).

### **Theme 3: Personality Factor and Semantic Accuracy**

From the comparative analyses of data, introverts were found semantically more accurate and relevant than extroverts who were comparatively random (I, 3; I, 5, E, 4; I, 8).

### **Theme 4: Personality Factor and Rhetorical Accuracy**

Extroverts were found rhetorically more accurate than introverts in various activities like group discussion, interactive sessions and presentations (E, 7; E, 12, E, 15; I, 17).

### **Theme 5: Personality Factor and Fluency**

To examine the extent to which personality affects fluency in oral communication, a comparative analysis of data revealed that fluency as a common denominator among the extroverts and introverts. A few introverts were found A few introverts were found to be notably fluent. Overall, extraversion appeared to significantly enhance initiative-taking and fluent communication (E, 9; E, 11; I, 4 & 9).

### **Theme 6: Personality Factor and Vocabulary**

Comparative analyses of data revealed that introverts were making good use vocabulary. Extroverts were found random in making choices of the words (I, 3; I, 5; I, 7; E, 14).

## **Discussion**

This study employed a phenomenological research design, with the intent to explore how personality type impacts the oral proficiency in a second language (L2). To achieve this goal, two personality measurement scales were used to identify distinct personality traits of the participants. Based on their scores, participants were classified as extroverts or introverts. After their personality traits were determined, an observational checklist was prepared to closely observe the participants in a variety of naturalistic classroom environment. This included observing their performance during class presentations; engagements in discussions, participation in peer and group activities, and their interactions with teachers. These activities were chosen to capture a comprehensive view of the participants' oral proficiency across different communicative situations. To achieve an unbiased, objective, and a more reliable understanding of the participants co-researchers were involved in observations. This collaborative approach helped in mitigating the potential biases that could arise from a single researcher's perspective or interpretation. The observation checklist developed for this study constituted multiple dimensions to examine the L2 oral performance. Key constructs included assessing fluency, accuracy in language use (such as grammatical, sociolinguistic, and semantic accuracy), and the appropriateness of vocabulary and cohesive devices in speech. Fluency emerged as the most significant aspect of oral performance across extroverts and introverts as well, demonstrating that the ability to speak fluently and coherently is crucial regardless of personality type. Interestingly, confidence in speaking was noted to vary widely among individuals and appeared to be more closely tied to individual characteristics rather than being strictly determined by whether one was an extrovert or introvert. Regarding vocabulary use, introverts consistently exhibited a higher proficiency level compared to extroverts. This further suggests that introverted individuals may prioritize precision and appropriateness of language more than extroverts in their oral communication. A comparative analysis of the various construct like fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary underscored that extraversion has a notable influence on the English language oral performance. Extroverts tended to exhibit different strengths and challenges compared to introverts, reflecting the dynamic interplay between personality traits and language proficiency. These findings echo earlier research by [Oya et al \(2004\)](#) and [Dewaele and Furnham \(2000\)](#), who similarly found that personality traits significantly impact language learning and communication skills. By adopting a phenomenological approach and integrating rigorous observational methods, this study contributes valuable insights into how personality influences L2 oral proficiency, offering implications for language educators and researchers alike.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has very meticulously structured its content into four cohesive sections. The initial section has focused on specifying the study's participants, followed by a detailed overview of the instruments used in data collection. The third section provides a thorough description of the procedures employed for data collection, while the final section explores the analysis and interpretation of the collected data. The primary objective of this study was to investigate how personality types influence oral proficiency in the English language. Upon determining the participants into extroverts and introverts based on their scores from the EPI and MBTI scales, the researchers and co-researchers immersed themselves in natural settings to observe participant behavior. Extroverted individuals were observed to exhibit traits such as being outspoken, confident, and fluent in their speech. In contrast, introverts demonstrated a tendency to use more a polished vocabulary in their verbal communication. Interestingly, the level of fluency among introverts appeared to be more individual-specific rather than entirely determined by their specific personality type. The comparative analyses of the data suggest that extraversion appeared to have an advantage over introversion in oral communication. These findings align with previous studies that have explored correlations between personality traits and various language skills, such as reading ([Carrell, 1991](#); [Bossers, 1991](#); [Bernhardt & Kamil, 1995](#); [Lee & Schallert, 1997](#); [Mehrpour, 2004](#)), writing ([Yun, 2005](#)), and listening ([Vandergrift, 2006](#)). However, this study addresses a noticeable gap in research specifically addressing the direct correlation between personality type and oral proficiency levels, which this study sought to qualitatively explore. The findings of this study resonate with earlier studies, more specifically of [Dewaele's \(2005\)](#) who concluded that extraversion is significantly influencing the oral proficiency of students. By assessing these qualitative aspects, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how personality traits overlap with language skills, thereby offering more valuable insights both for the teachers and future research in this realm.

## Pedagogical Implications

This study has undertaken an in-depth exploration of the complex dynamics of personality traits—extroversion and introversion—and its impact on the oral communication skills of ESL learners in the EMI classrooms of Pakistani universities. By systematically analyzing the inherent strengths and weaknesses inherent to each personality type, the research further aims to examine as what extent personality traits influencing an individual's verbal communication abilities.

The findings indicate that extroverts are often characterized by their inherent sociability, assertiveness, and eagerness to initiate interaction and communicate. Biologically predisposed to external stimuli, their extroverts are driven by their outgoing nature to seek opportunities for verbal interaction, whether through casual conversations, group discussions, or formal presentations. This predisposition toward external engagement not only facilitates increased verbal practice but it also strengthens their self-confidence and spontaneity in speaking. Moreover, their readiness to initiate conversations cultivate a sense of easiness with public speaking, which further make them to adapt and communicate fluently. Their sociable nature reduces their hesitation and anxiety even while addressing unfamiliar audiences. This further develop their verbal expressiveness. Within the ESL context of Pakistani universities, extroverts ESL learners facilitate classroom interaction. This could be an inspiring stimulus for the introverts viz a viz for enhanced comprehension.

Compared to the extroverts, introverts are generally inclined in preferring solitude and are more controlled in intimate interactions. Their reticence and contemplative nature limit their willingness to participate actively in communication thereby restricting them in finding opportunities to practice and refine their speaking skills. This introspective inclination led them to reflect which may further result in a more deliberate and reserved style of communication. Although it is believed that introverts exhibit strong listening skills and thoughtful responses, their comparative reluctance to verbalize ideas promptly may be considered as the lack of confidence. Consequently, while being limited in their engagement in spontaneous verbal exchanges hinder the development of fluency and adaptability in oral communication.

Regarding pedagogical implications, this study found that extroversion provides a clear advantage regarding oral proficiency. The frequency and quality of extroverts' verbal interactions contribute significantly to their comfort and skill in expressing themselves. Conversely, introverts' preference for solitude and reduced verbal practice can result in a more measured but less fluid speaking style. These findings are consistent with previous research by [Dewaele and Furnham \(2000\)](#), [Oya et al., \(2004\)](#), and [Dewaele \(2005\)](#), all of whom have underscored the influence of personality traits on language acquisition and communicative competence.

Furthermore, the study expands the understanding of how individual differences—particularly personality types—can shape language proficiency. Considering the nuanced relationship between personality and language use has essential implications for educators and language professionals. Tailoring teaching methods to accommodate various personality profiles can create more inclusive and effective learning environments. For instance, incorporating collaborative, interactive activities for extroverted learners while allowing reflective, independent tasks for introverted individuals can foster balanced development in oral communication skills. Understanding these distinctions not only aids educators in addressing learners' unique needs but also empowers individuals to leverage their inherent strengths while addressing their communication challenges. Ultimately, appreciating the interplay between personality and communication can lead to more effective strategies in language education, promoting more holistic and personalized approaches to language learning.

## References

- Alastair, G. (2004). Personality and language learning: The role of extroversion and introversion. *The Language Learning Journal*, 30(1), 3–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730485200061>
- Alavinia, P., & Hassanlou, A. (2014). Extroversion/introversion and test performance of Iranian EFL learners on dichotomous and constructed response items. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 513–521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.448>
- Alavinia, P., & Sameei, A. (2012). A study of the relationship between extroversion/introversion and grammatical knowledge of Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 5(6), 191–200. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n6p191>
- Bernhardt, E. B., & Kamil, M. L. (1995). Interpreting relationships between L1 and L2 reading: Consolidating the linguistic threshold and the linguistic interdependence hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 15–34. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.1.15>
- Bossers, B. (1991). On thresholds, ceilings and short-circuits: The relation between L1 reading, L2 reading and L2 knowledge. *ALLA Review*, 8, 45–60.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Longman.
- Burruss, J. D., & Kaenzig, L. (1999). *Introversion: The often forgotten factor impacting the gifted*. National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extroversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*, 32(1), 109–132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1982.tb00522.x>
- Carrell, P. L. (1991). Second language reading: Reading ability or language proficiency? *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 159–179. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/12.2.159>
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2007). *Personality and individual differences*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Chuang, Y. Y. (2009). The effects of computer-mediated communication on the development of oral proficiency. *CALICO Journal*, 27(1), 72–89.
- Dewaele, J.-M. (2005). Sociodemographic, psychological and politico-cultural correlates in Flemish students' attitudes towards French and English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26(2), 118–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434630508668402>
- Dewaele, J.-M., & Furnham, A. (2000). Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(2), 355–365. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(99\)00106-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00106-3)
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher
- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(3), 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.2307/327627>

- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., & Yuan, F. (2003). The effects of planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in second language narrative writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(1), 59–84.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1967). The biological basis of personality (100-117). Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). Psychophysiology and the development of personality: An experimental and theoretical study. In H. J. Eysenck & P. Barrett (Eds.), *Psychophysiology and personality: A review* (pp. 1–35). Springer.
- Fazeli, S. H. (2011). The exploring nature of the assessment instrument of second language learners' learning styles and their personality types: Focusing on introversion and extroversion. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(15), 5204–5214.
- Fazeli, S. H. (2012). The exploring nature of the assessment instrument of second language learners' learning styles and their personality types: Focusing on introversion and extroversion. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(15), 5204–5214.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Newbury House Publishers.
- Griffiths, C. (2008). *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harley, B., & Swain, M. (1984). The interlanguage of immersion students and its implications for second language teaching. In A. Davies, C. Cripe, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), *Interlanguage* (pp. 291–311). Edinburgh University Press.
- Harley, B., Allen, P., Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1990). *The development of second language proficiency*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hedge, T. (2008). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.
- Jianing, X. (2007). Storytelling in the EFL speaking classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 13(11).
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five Trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). Guilford Press.
- Kiany, G. R. (1998). English proficiency and academic achievement in relation to extraversion: A preliminary study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 113–129.
- Lazaraton, A. (1996). A qualitative approach to monitoring oral language testing: The case of an ESL placement test. *Language Testing*, 13(1), 29–47.
- Lee, J.-W., & Schallert, D. L. (1997). The relative contribution of L2 language proficiency and L1 reading ability to L2 reading performance: A test of the threshold hypothesis in an EFL context. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(4), 713–739.
- Leeming, P., & Cunningham, K. (2012). The effect of personality traits on the accuracy of second language oral performance. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(4), 1–23.
- Lennon, P. (1990). Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach. *Language Learning*, 40(3), 387–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1990.tb00669.x>
- Levelt, W. J. M., Roelofs, A., & Meyer, A. S. (2000). A theory of lexical access in speech production. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(1), 1–75.
- Luchini, P. L. (2007). Developing oral skills through communicative and interactive tasks. *Revista de la Facultad de Ciencias Humanas*, 4(1), 23–35.
- MBTI. (1998). *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Mehrpour, S. (2004). The impact of text length on EFL students' reading comprehension. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 35(1), 47–61.
- Myers, I. B. (2007). *Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Nodoushan, M. A. S. (2011). Temperament as an indicator of language achievement. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 5(4), 33–52.
- Omaggio, A. C. (1986). *Teaching language in context: Proficiency-oriented instruction*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1063>
- Pfister, G. (2000). The impact of extraversion on language learning. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(2), 221–233.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.



- Sharma, S. (2008). Personality and language learning: A study on extroversion and introversion among Indian ESL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 142–165.
- Sharp, A. (2003). Language learning and awareness. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(3), 536–548.
- Shumin, K. (1997). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. *English Teaching Forum*, 35(3), 8–13.
- Spada, N., & Tomita, Y. (2010). Interactions between type of instruction and type of language feature: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 263–308.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–256). Newbury House.
- Tuan, L. T., & Neomy, S. (2007). Investigating group planning in preparing for oral presentations in an EFL class in Vietnam. *RELC Journal*, 38(1), 104–124.
- Vandergrift, L. (2006). Second language listening: Listening ability or language proficiency? *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(1), 6–18.
- Wakamoto, N. (2000). Language anxiety, intelligence, and oral performance in EFL classrooms. *IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 38(1), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2000.38.1.71>
- Wakamoto, N. (2000). *Language learning strategy use and personality characteristics*. Hituzi Syobo Publishing.
- Warschauer, M. (1996). Motivational aspects of using computers for writing and communication. In M. Warschauer (Ed.), *Telecollaboration in foreign language learning: Proceedings of the Hawai'i Symposium* (pp. 29–46). Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Wu, S. M. (2001). The relationship between extraversion/introversion and oral proficiency of Chinese students in an ESL setting. *System*, 29(2), 235–248.
- Yun, J. (2005). An investigation into the relationship between L2 learners' writing and personality types. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 174–190.
- Yusoff, M. S. B., Rahim, A. F. A., & Esa, A. R. (2010). The relationships between personality, learning styles, and academic performance of medical students. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 1, 28–32.
- 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*, 1(1), 33–40.

