

Difference Between the Performance of Extrovert and Introvert EFL Learners on Task-Based Information-Gap, Opinion-Gap And Reasoning-Gap Activities

¹Reza Gholami, ²Elham Sermanshahi, ³Ali Azadi, ⁴Rajan Periannan, ⁵Reza Vaseghi

^{1 & 2 & 5} Department of Language and Humanities Education, Faculty of Educational Studies,
University Putra Malaysia (UPM)

³ Isfahan Azad University (IAU)

⁴Sendayan Secondary School, Malaysia

Abstract

This research investigated the difference between the performance of extrovert and introvert EFL learners on Task Based activities in an Iranian English School. The task types investigated here were information-gap, opinion-gap and reasoning-gap activities based on the Bangalore Project activities (Prabhu, 1987). It was hypothesized that introversion and extroversion can affect learning in some ways. Then, this paper investigated such affectivity facets which seem to influence learners' performance on tasks offered in English classrooms in Mashhad, Iran. Therefore, three research questions and null hypotheses were established to find out if there is any significant difference between the performances of extrovert and introvert EFL learners on information-gap, opinion-gap and reasoning-gap activities. Then, a random sample of 140 participants in the English School was drawn who firstly took a standard Eysenck' Personality Questionnaire-Revised to have their personality dimension determined, afterward their performances were evaluated within 6 weeks using a research-made rating checklist with a reliability of .87. It included 5 categories based on which the performances were evaluated. These categories consisted of task fulfillment, fluency and comprehensibility, grammatical accuracy, appropriateness, vocabulary selection. The data (scores) for information-gap and reasoning-gap activities were not normally distributed and therefore on-parametric Mann-Whitney test was employed to examine the difference between the performances of the two introvert and extrovert groups but for opinion-gap there was a normal distribution and to compare the means of two independent groups for determining the difference between them, a t-test was utilized. The results revealed that: For the performance of information-gap activity, there was no statistically significant difference between two Introvert and Extrovert groups since p-value was greater than 0.05 ($p=0.311$). For the performance of reasoning-gap activity, there was no statistically significant difference between two Introvert and Extrovert groups since p-value was greater than 0.05 ($p=0.752$). Finally, for Opinion-gap activities, it was concluded that there was no statistical difference between two groups since the result for the t test was $t(138) = .174$ with a p -value of 0.862. In general, the results suggest that both extrovert and introvert perform with no significant difference regarding different task based activities and because introverts are usually



underestimated among Iranian teachers, the results of this study might bring an understanding that in task-based language classes, there should be less concern about the performance of introvert learners because they do as much well as the stereotyped extroverts. The detailed results and conclusions will be discussed intensively in the paper.

Keywords: Extroversion & introversion, TBLT, information-gap, reasoning-gap, and Opinion-gap

1. Introduction

There have always been some classes with which the teachers are not satisfied regarding the final performance of the students and think some students are not successful enough. Spolsky, B. (1989 p.2) states that "it is always the case that some individuals are more successful than others in mastering the language, even though the language has in all cases been ostensibly identical" Regarding this, two issues can be then brought into investigation. Firstly, we need to know what teaching method has been applied for such classes. Secondly, Psychological Factors need to be considered as influencing factors. This research investigated the difference between the performances of extrovert and introvert EFL students (as psychological factors) on task based activities (as a teaching method). By deeply looking at the change regarding the student's role in his learning from a traditional view up to constructivist's view, we can conclude that personal characteristics can affect the way a person thinks and interacts. Researchers have found out that certain factors function simultaneously and produce what you may call a social interactive language. Among such factors, this research will try to investigate personality traits which seem to have a central role in constructing (or generating or conveying) meaning (Willis D. & J. Willis (2001), Willis, J. (2000), Nunan, D. (1989, 1999 & 2001).

Brown, H. D. (2007) has categorized psychological and sociocultural factors as two facets of the *Affective Domain* of the second language acquisition. Personality factors within a person seem to contribute in some way to the success of language learning. It is worth mentioning that the researchers have considered a group of trait related issues including affect, emotion, self-esteem, self-efficacy, inhibition, risk taking, anxiety, empathy, motivation and extroversion as main affective factors (Hilgrad, E.R. 1983, Gerald Matthews, J. J. D.,



Martha C. Whiteman 2003, Eysenck, H. J. 1968 & 1947, Brown, H. D. 2007, Burger, J. M. 2000, Spolsky, B. 1989 and Allen, B. P. 2000 among which the last one, extroversion and its counterpart introversion was chosen among *Personality Traits* as “an intrinsic side of the affectivity” (Brown, H. D. 2007, p.152) and its effect on performance and achievement of EFL students on task based activities was investigated as the direction of this study.

Extroversion according to Brown H. D. simply means the extent to which a person has a deep-seated need to receive ego enhancement, self-esteem, and a sense of wholeness from other people as opposed to receiving that affirmation within self. Extroverts actually need other people in order to feel good. But introverts are not necessarily loudmouthed and talkative. They may be relatively shy but still need the affirmation from others. Introversion, on the other hand, is the extent to which a person derives a sense of wholeness and fulfillment apart from a reflection of this self from other people (Brown, H. D. 2007,) By emergence of constructivism which integrated linguistic, psychological, and sociological paradigms, this concept by Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers (2003, p. 244) conforms this reality that “the commonest solution to the language teaching problem was seen to lie in the adoption of a new teaching approach or method”. Constructivism focuses mainly on social interaction and the discovery, of meaning. The emphasis is put either on the importance of learners constructing their own representation of reality or the importance of social interaction and cooperative learning in constructing both cognitive and emotional images of reality. In most text books, methods and approaches have been divided into major trends of the twentieth century, alternative methods and approaches and current communicative approaches appearing after the emergence of communicative methodologies in 1980s. (Brown, H. D. 2007, Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers, 2003 and Larson-Freeman, D. 2001)

This research investigated Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) since “it can be regarded as a recent version of a communicative methodology” (Richards and Rodgers, p. 151) and a major focal point of language teaching practice worldwide (Brown, H. D. 2007, p.242) It highlights classroom interaction and learner-centered teaching. Moreover, it views the learner’s experience as a significant contribution to learning process. TBLT proposes the



notion of task as a central unit of planning and teaching (Richards and Rodgers, p. 224). P. Skehan (2003) defines tasks as “an activity which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective. In another definition, Skehan emphasizes that: “success in tasks is evaluated in terms of achievement of an outcome, and tasks generally bear some resemblance to real-life language use” (Skehan, 1996b, p.20).

In this research, three task types were chosen as central activities based on the Bangalore Project conducted by Prabhu in 1987. These activities include information-gap, opinion-gap and reasoning-gap activities. An information-gap activity involves the exchange of information among participants in order to complete a task. An opinion-gap activity is identifying, and articulating a personal preference, feeling, or attitude in response to a given situation. And a reasoning-gap activity requires students to derive some new information by referring it from information they have been given (Prabhu, 1987, p.46). As learners work to complete these tasks, they have abundant opportunity to interact and such interaction is thought to facilitate language acquisition as learners have to work to understand each other and express their own meaning (Larsen-Freeman, 2001) which is the central point in Task-Based Approach (Feez, S., 1998. Crookes, G., 1986). Since the students get engaged in these activities, their personal traits may influence the learning outcome significantly because these task based activities require the learners to rely on their personal imagination and way of thinking and then their learning outcome is supposed to be affected by personality factors either positively or negatively. This is why Brown asserts that “If we were to devise theories of second language acquisition or teaching methodologies that were based only on cognitive considerations, we should be omitting the most fundamental side of human behavior” (Brown, H. D. 2007, p.152) Ernest Hilgard (1983) also notes that “A purely cognitive theory is rejected unless a role is given to affectivity” (Hilgard, p. 267). Hence we see here that during performing the Task Based activities, personality traits work actively and might even affect the performance to some extent. It is mostly supposed that introverts are reserved and quiet and have a tendency to reclusiveness while extroverts are considered loudmouthed and talkative. We might then misunderstand these traits as Brown mentions the reason as “because of a tendency to stereotype extroversion” (Brown, H. D., 2007p. 166) (Eysenck, H.J, 1947 &1968)





In Iran, English classes in governmental schools are still taught traditionally (using methods like GTM) in which the students have the least control on the learning process, such a thing can affect the learning habits in general and they cannot easily move toward learning of a second language independently in which they are supposed to freely negotiate meaning while in private English classes, task-based language teaching, audio-lingual method, etc are employed which have brought much better results regarding the students' overall English competency. The interference of old improper habits of both learners and teachers may seem to be very hard to cope with. In EFL environments like Iran where English language is mostly taught traditionally, the ideas of teaching through tasks and teaching the students how to learn and control learning seem a hard and tough activity due to the mentioned problems. Age, culture, irrelevant topics and getting used to traditional learning may compound the problem of personality trait, introversion in particular. What this research determined was whether or not there is any difference between extroversion and introversion and the students' performance on task based activities during which the learners need to be in direct negotiation and interaction with the peers and the teacher in the classrooms of a private English school in Iran in which TBLT is applied for a long time. The research tried to determine whether extroverts perform significantly better comparing to the introverts because it is supposed that introverts tend to be quiet, a fact that might be considered as influencing their performances on information gap, opinion gap or reasoning gap activities.

2. Extroversion and introversion

Extroversion simply means the extent to which a person has a deep-seated need to receive ego enhancement, self-esteem, and a sense of wholeness from other people as opposed to receiving that affirmation within self. Extroverts actually need other people in order to feel good. But introverts are not necessarily loudmouthed and talkative. They may be relatively shy but still need the affirmation from others. Introversion, on the other hand, is the extent to which a person derives a sense of wholeness and fulfillment apart from a reflection of this self from other people. (Brown 2007, Gerald Matthewset al 2003, Burger, J. M. 2000, Allen, B. P. 2000, Hilgrad, E.R.1983, Eysenck, H. J. 1968 &1947) The introvert has a more subjective while the introvert a more objective outlook. The introvert shows a higher degree





of behavioral activity and shows a tendency to self-control (inhibition) whereas the extrovert shows a lack of such control (Eysenck, 1947).

3. Task Based Language Teaching and Tasks

TBLT refers to an approach based on the use of tasks as the nucleus unit of planning and instruction in language teaching. Some advocates believe that it is a logical development of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Bretta and Davis, 1985; Prabhu, 1987; Beretta, 1990) A task based approach aims to provide learners with a natural context for language use. As learners work to complete a task, they have abundant opportunity to interact. Such interaction is taught to facilitate language acquisition as learners have to work to understand each other and to express their own meaning. By so doing, they have to check to see if they have comprehended correctly and, at times, they have to seek clarification. By interacting with each others, they get to listen to language which may be beyond their present ability, but which may be assimilated into their knowledge of the target language for use at a later time (Larson-Freeman, D. 2001; Brown, 2007). “Engaging learners in task work provides a better context for the activation of learning processes than form-focused activities, and hence ultimately provides better opportunities for language learning to take place” (Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S.,2003, p. 223). Willis D. & J. Willis (2001) assert that: “in contrast to form-based approaches, task-based learning (TBL) involves the specification not of a sequence of language items, but of a sequence of communicative tasks to be carried out in the target language. Central to the notion of communicative task is the exchange of meanings.” Moreover, they state that TBL represents an attempt to harness natural processes and to provide language focus activities based on consciousness-raising which will support these processes. Task-based learning is a very good approach to getting people to interact conversationally, without being limited to conversation classes “(Nunan, 1989). By turning to task, in general, it is a piece of meaning-focused work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form (Nunan, 1989, p. 10).). Crookes defines a task as “a piece of work or an activity, usually with a specified objective, undertaken as a part of an educational course, at work, or used to elicit data for research” (Crookes, 1986, p. 1)



4. Hypotheses

The specific objectives of this research were to determine the difference between extrovert and introvert EFL learner's performances on information-gap, reasoning-gap and opinion-gap activities. Then based on the research objectives, three null hypotheses of the study were established as follow:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between extrovert and introvert EFL learner's performances on information-gap activities.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between extrovert and introvert EFL learner's performances on reasoning-gap activities.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference between extrovert and introvert EFL learner's performances on opinion-gap activities.

While alternatively, it was believed there is such difference between the performances of extroverts and introverts with a preference towards extroverts as the dominant and more competent students. The following deals with the method in details and in next part, the data analysis and results are presented.

5. Method

5.1 Participants

A total of 140 male and female subjects, 75 extroverts and 65 introverts, out of 300 students enrolled in the pre-intermediate level of a private English School in Mashhad, Iran were randomly chosen. The subjects ranged in age from 17 to 18 and all had the same English background knowledge. At pre-intermediate level, they could express themselves more meaningfully and take part in conversations interactively and have an active role in information exchange, a level which was more appropriate for the purpose of this research.

5.2 Materials and Questionnaires

5.2.1 EPQ-R



One of the instruments in this research was Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire-Revised (EPQ-R) in Persian Language (subjects' native language) to determine the students' traits and in particular the extroversion and introversion. This questionnaire which is suitable for people above 16 years old, had been widely used in Iran both educationally and psychologically and had been validated frequently through previous studies and its reliability was 73% for students for the educational purposes. It was selected because it had been standardized educationally and for which there was an established validity and reliability. In the questionnaire the subjects were asked to reply yes or no to 57 questions. EPQ-R contained a Lie Scale to measure the subjects' tendencies to fake good while completing the questionnaire (Gerald Matthews, et al, 2003, p. 22). After the sample was randomly selected (140 Subjects), on different days, they were given the Persian version of EPQ-R. The results were checked through the answer sheet. Finally, 65 introvert and 75 extrovert male and female subjects were identified through EPQ-R.

5.2.2 Checklist of Assessing Learners' Oral Proficiency (CALOP):

This checklist was used to assess each single subject's performance of three task types while performing and completing them during the natural class setting and schedule within 6 weeks. For a better evaluation, the Checklist of Assessing Learners' Oral Proficiency was used because all of the different task types could be observed and evaluated by the researcher and could give a better view about the hypothesized difference on the performances of the extrovert and introvert groups. The categories or criteria selected for the checklist tried to mostly include the most frequent common categories of the other scales and make the most appropriate scale for the purpose of this study. The main focus was to evaluate the students' performance of information-gap activity, reasoning-gap activity, and opinion-gap activity. Considering the diversity of the task types, it was decided to include the following criteria and categories each of which had a score range from 1 to 4. A score of 1 was the lowest and 4 was the highest score of the task performance and because there were 5 categories on the checklist, a total score of 20 could be attained by the students. These categories included, task fulfillment, fluency and comprehensibility, grammatical accuracy, appropriateness, and vocabulary selection. To establish the validity, it checklist was referred to panels of experts. With the suggestions and comments from the





panel of experts and the research supervisory committee members, the survey was then modified to account for the suggested changes. Through a pilot study, this revised checklist was used to measure its internal consistency. Chronbach's alpha and item total correlations assessed its internal consistency reliability. Overall, the five combined components that comprised the Checklist were found to have an overall internal consistency of .87. Then, the checklist was used to evaluate the subjects' performances within 6 weeks whose data were then transferred to SPSS.16.0 and analyzed.

5.3 Procedure

After deciding about the materials aforementioned, at first, a pilot study was conducted to determine the students' personality dimensions, to examine CALOP's reliability and to determine the sample size. Then 140 male and female students who had enrolled in the mentioned English Language School were observed within six weeks. These students had been randomly chosen and were in different classes. The researcher observed every student's performances of three task based activities through different sessions and evaluated them using CALOP. A score between 0 and 20 was given to each student for each activity separately. Finally all the data (raw scores) were transferred to the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software, Version 16.0 (student Version) for data analysis and hypotheses testing. To decrease the observer's effect, students were not informed their performances were under observation. Hence, it is believed that students were not significantly affected due to the presence of an observer.

6. Data Analysis

Various statistical procedures were used to examine differences between the two groups and to discover if any significant difference exists between the introvert and extrovert students' performance of information-gap, reasoning-gap, and opinion-gap activities. Collected data (scores ranging between 0-20) were transferred to SPSS. Descriptive statistics have been employed to report the data including the students' performances scores obtained by the researcher through the checklist of oral proficiency assessment scale on three task type activities (Information-gap, reasoning-gap, and opinion-gap activities). The following steps



were taken in order to provide a statistical analysis of the independent and dependent variables:

- Assigning numerical values to task based activity performances of the learners
- Separating data into two groups (introverts and extroverts)
- Entering the data into SPSS software for data analysis purposes.
- Performing Test of normality, independent sample t-test (parametric test), and Mann-Whitney test (non-parametric test) to discover if there is any statistically significant difference among the independent introvert and extrovert groups.

7. Results and findings

This study explored the difference in EFL performances of Iranian introverted and extroverted learners on three task based activities including information-gap, reasoning-gap and opinion-gap activities which were the main task types of the Bangalore Project as well (1987). The nature of this study was quantitative and the study tried to investigate the performance differences between two groups. The sample of this study was drawn randomly and consisted of 65 introverts and 75 extroverts. During the data collection procedure, the researcher observed all the students through different sessions in the natural setting of the class based on the checklist of task type assessment. After the data was transferred to SPSS, descriptive data, Independent Sample t-Test and Mann-Whitney Non-Parametric tests were completed to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the independent groups. Three hypotheses (H_{01} - H_{03}) were tested to respond to the research questions proposed in this study demonstrating that:

- I. H_{01} : Data were not normally distributed for two extrovert and introvert learners' performances on information-gap activities, and then a non-parametric Mann-Whitney test needed to be run because it has no assumptions such as normality of the distribution. The results (presented in appendices 2 and 3) showed that there was no significant difference between two Introvert and Extrovert groups' performance of information gap activity since p-value is greater than 0.05 ($p=0.311$) and it fails to reject H_0 . For information gap activity, the mean rank for introverts was 74.20 with the sum of ranks of 4823.00. The mean rank for extroverts was 67.29 with the sum of ranks of 5047.00. Based on the output described

in tables 2 and 3, Mann-Whitney test shows the fact that asymp. sig. (2-tailed) value of .311 was not below .05, and therefore, not significant and it failed to reject H_0 . To sum up, there was insufficient evidence to conclude that differences in information-gap activities existed between introvert and extrovert EFL learners.

II. H_{02} : Because the scores were not normally distributed for two extrovert and introvert learners' performances on Reasoning-gap activities, then Mann-Whitney test was applied. The results (presented in appendices 4 & 5) showed that there was no significant difference between two Introvert and Extrovert groups' performance of Reasoning gap activity since p-value is greater than 0.05 ($p=.752$) and it fails to reject H_0 . Therefore, it was concluded that there was no significant difference between two Introvert and Extrovert groups' performance of Reasoning-gap activity. For Reasoning-gap activity, the mean rank for introverts was 71.66 with the sum of ranks of 4658.00. The mean rank for extroverts was 69.49 with the sum of ranks of 5212.00. Based on the output described in tables 4.8 and 4.9, Mann-Whitney test shows the fact that asymp. sig. (2-tailed) value of .752 was not below .05, and therefore, not significant and it failed to reject H_0 . To sum up, There was insufficient evidence to conclude that differences in Reasoning-gap activities existed between introvert and extrovert EFL learners

III. H_{03} : For the third task based activity, the data were normally distributed for both extrovert and introvert learners, then to determine performance difference of Opinion Gap Scores between Introvert and Extrovert groups, an independent sample t- test was employed because its assumption (normality of distribution) was met and applied. Appendix7 displays the results of the Independent Samples *t*-Test for the introverted and extroverted group. To be statistically significantly different at the .05 level, the *t* value would need to be greater than 2.00. The Levene statistic tests the hypothesis of equality of variance of the dependent variable grades. A low significance value (typically less than .05) would indicate significant variance between the groups. A significance value of .918 indicates a lack of significant variance between the grades of this group. This indicates that there is no statistical difference in the performance difference of Opinion Gap Scores between Introvert and Extrovert groups. The final result for the *t* test was $t(138) = .174$ with a *p*-value of 0.862.

Therefore, with a 95% confidence level, Null Hypothesis 3 is accepted. To sum up, there was insufficient evidence to conclude that differences in Opinion-gap activities existed between introvert and extrovert EFL learners.

8. Conclusions and discussion

This research can be regarded as an attempt to open an avenue into the mind of English teachers and direct them to the realities by which they would stop underestimating introverts. Teachers' preference of any of these personality traits might have deteriorating effects on the atmosphere of the class and the learners in the sense that they might be discouraged and demotivated and probably stop attending the classes consequently. Since TBLT is increasingly applied in Iran, knowing that there is no difference between extroverts' and introverts' performance in TBLT classes, might help teachers to focus on the teaching itself and in case of any problem in the performance of the learners, they can seek and find the solution in other sources apart from the personality. Based on the structure of this research, task based activities regarding the performances of the two groups and extroversion and introversion as factors affecting learning will be discussed as follow:

Considering three task types, it is confirmed by the results that performing each type of tasks is not dependant on or influenced by the mentioned personality traits. It is of note that the obtained results here are congruent with the findings reported earlier by Gholami (2011) and Gholami, Vaseghi, and Barjasteh, (2011). The former reported that *gender differences do not correlate with the performance of task based activities while the latter study found that extroversion is not a benefit in a task-based language classroom*. In fact, one of the concerns of English teachers in TBLT classes might probably be the students' participation particularly in pair or group works. Information gap activity involves a transfer of given information from one person to another – or from one form to another or from one place to another (Prabhu, 1987, p. 46). Based on the current misconception, introverts might not intend or be verbally able to transfer the required amount of information for they are willing to be the quieter partners or the poorer ones. This research concluded that both introvert and extrovert learners are the active partners in successfully conveying the meaning through pair works and the achievement of the goals would not be hampered regarding the performance of the



information-gap activities. Regarding reasoning-gap activities which are in fact deriving some new information from given information through process of inference, practical reasoning, or a perception of relationships or patterns, both extrovert and introvert learners performed acceptably and demonstrated no statistical differences over the task types. Reasoning-gap activity “involves comprehending, and conveying information, as in information gap activity, but the information to be conveyed is identical with that initially comprehended. There is a piece of reasoning which connects the two” (Prabhu, 1987, p. 46). Teachers need not worry in the sense that introverted students or probably extroverted ones may be unable to convey meaning through timetables, etc and they can be assured that students of both personality types perform somewhat similarly on negotiating the gap in their thoughts and can infer and come to a conclusion based on the required instructions of the planned lessons. Finally, for opinion-gap activities defined by Prabhu (1987, p.47) as activities which involve identifying and articulating a personal preference, feeling, or attitude in response to a given situation, the research came to an interesting judgment. Prabhu (1987) in Bangalore Project mentions that there is no objective procedure for demonstrating outcomes as right or wrong, and no reason to expect the same outcome from different individuals or on different occasions. Then, he asserts that there exists a pedagogic complexity with opinion-gap activity because it is naturally open-ended in outcomes and then he recommended such task type for advanced level learners in a second/foreign language because the value of open-ended activity can be better realized in developing linguistic capacity. But for lower levels, such activity leads to learners’ verbal imitation and thus stops being open-ended (Prabhu, 1987, p.49). Although the students from pre-intermediate levels and took part in conversations interactively, both groups attained lower scores on the last task type activity (opinion-gap) and confirmed Prabhu’s notion of suitability of such a task for advanced learners. He asserts that interaction in an opinion-gap activity is likely to have too high a level of unpredictability, thus making it difficult for learners to cope (Prabhu, 1987, p.49). Accordingly, extroverts and introverts performed with no significant difference on information-gap, reasoning-gap and opinion-gap activities. More interestingly they both had lower scores (and ability) on doing opinion-gap activities in which they had to state meaning which was their own. Such a fact, as confirmed by Prabhu “... leads to a high level of uncertainty, diffidence, or anxiety, though it offers correspondingly high level of pleasure from success” (Prabhu, 1987, p.49). As far as it is





shown by the relevant literature, various notions have been posed to find out the relationship between extroversion and introversion and many other factors. For years a preference or priority is given to either of these personality traits and it has been demonstrated that sometimes each of these traits affect learning in some ways and the learners belonging to each trait outperform their counterparts. Despite this fact, it needs to be asserted here that it cannot be definitely claimed which learners with a definite personality trait outperforms the other in language learning. Psychologically, extroverts and introverts are different and behave according to their traits; however, in language learning, more detailed research seems to be needed to determine which learners learn better or outperform. This might remain as a misconception or be proved as an existing fact sometime in future.

9. Future works

The following recommendations for further research are made: Because this study was limited to students in Iran EFL context, a study including EFL learners in another EFL or even ESL countries would verify or reject the findings of this study. Besides, this study can be replicated with the same procedure for subjects from advanced levels to extract more information about the field. This study was aimed to the performance of the introverts and extroverts, a study to determine the difference between the performance of male and female students over these task based activities (gender rather than trait) might probably reveal more information if there really is a difference regarding the task types traits and their assumed effects on TBLT performances.

Moreover, personality traits other than extroversion and its counterpart can be scrutinized through these tasks to reveal more reliable results concerning personality traits and their assumed effects on TBLT performances.

Referemces

- Gholami, R., Sharifah, Z. & Ghazali M. (2009). *A rather ignored trigger in EFL contexts*. In MELTA, Proceedings of the 18th MELTA International Conference, 11-13 June, 2009, Johur Baru, Malaysia
- Hilgrad, E.R. (1983), *Introduction to Psychology*, Harcourt Publishers.



Larson-Freeman, D. (2001). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press, Inc. 2nd Ed.

Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. (2004), *Second Language Learning Theories*. 2nd ed. University of Southampton

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nunan, D. (2001). *Aspects of task-based syllabus design*. [on-line]. Available: <http://www.nunan.info>

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*, Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2003). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. 2nd Ed. Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for Second Language Learning, Introduction to a General Theory*. Oxford University Press

Willis D. & J. Willis (2001). *Task-Based Language Learning. In the Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Edited by Carter R. & D. Nunan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Willis, J. (2000). *A holistic approach to task-based course design* [on-line]. Available: <http://langu.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/2000/feb/wilis.html>

APPENDIX 1: Test of Normality

APPENDIX 2: Output of Mann-Whitney Test Ranks for Information-Gap Scores

	Character	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
INFORMATION-GAP SCORES	INTROVERT	65	74.20	4823.00
	EXTROVERT	75	67.29	5047.00
	Total	140		

APPENDIX

3: Output of Mann-Whitney Test Statistics ^a for Information-Gap Scores



	INFORMATION-GAP SCORES
Mann-Whitney U	2197.000
Wilcoxon W	5047.000
Z	-1.012
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.311

a. Grouping Variable: Character

APPENDIX 4: Output of Mann-Whitney Test Ranks for Reasoning Gap Scores

	Character	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
REASONING-GAP SCORES	INTROVERT	65	71.66	4658.00
	EXTROVERT	75	69.49	5212.00
	Total	140		

APPENDIX

5: Output of Mann-Whitney Test Statistics ^a for Reasoning Gap Scores

	REASONING-GAP SCORES
Mann-Whitney U	2362.000
Wilcoxon W	5212.000
Z	-.316
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.752

a. Grouping Variable: Character

APPENDIX 6: Group Statistics for Opinion Gap Scores

	Character	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std.
Error Mean OPINION-GAP SCORES	INTROVERT	65	14.27	2.03	.25
	EXTROVERT	75	14.21	2.02	.23





APPENDIX 7: Independent Sample t-test for Opinion Gap Scores

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		t	df	Sig. (2-
		tailed)		
OPINION-GAP SCORES	Equal variances assumed	.174	138	.862
	Equal variances not assumed		.174	135.15
				.862

