

---

## IMPACT OF INTROVERSION/EXTROVERSION PERSONALITY TYPES IN ESL PROFIECIENCY IN WRITING SKILL AT MASTER LEVEL

**Muhammad Tariq Ayub,**

Assistant Professor of English, Govt. College of Science, Multan.  
tariqayoub2000@yahoo.com. Cell # +923027533645.

**Hina Shaheen,**

Department of Humanities,  
COMSATS Institute of Information Technology Vehari Campus.  
hinasheheen@ciitvehari.edu.pk Cell # +923047451320.  
Corresponding Author: Hina Shaheen. Cell # 92304751320

**Prof. Dr. Abdul Ghafoor Awan,**

Dean, Faculty of Management and Social Sciences,  
Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan-Pakistan.  
drabdulghafoorawan@gmail.com Cell # +923136015051.

**Sumera Saleem,**

Lecturer of English, Department of Humanities,  
COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Lahore.  
sumairasaleem@ciitlahore.edu.pk Cell# +923337292753.

---

### ABSTRACT

*This study aimed to investigate the impact of extraversion/introversion personality traits in learning writing skills of English as a second language. The study aimed to check the problem regarding two contradictory claims: First hypothesis was proposed by some language specialists in 1970s such as Brown (2000) and Naiman (1978) according to which extraverts are considered as better language learners because they possess more ability to learn language by using the data which is delivered to them and they can give better results in language learning. The second hypothesis was proposed by Eysenck (1985) which says that extraverts possess lower ability of concentration, and their concentration can be easily diverted which results by making them more weak in controlling mental diversion. The research sample consisted of 193 participants who have undertaken instruction on "Essay Writing" and "Study Skills" for six months as a course of study in their M.A English Program. The research tools consisted of a questionnaire and an achievement test on writing skills. The questionnaire consisted of 30 items all adopted from Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire to measure the introversion/extroversion traits of students' personality. The findings revealed that a significant difference exists between the writing achievement of introvert and extravert learner groups. Moreover, the results further revealed that introverts are better learners of ESL writing skills than the extroverts.*

**Key words:** introverts, extraverts, individual differences, writing skills, Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The process of learning a second language (SL), not at all like the main language procurement which is said to be gained unclearly by all people, reveals inconceivable individual variability among learners as far as their definitive achievement in a second language. Research directed on the second language procurement (in the future SLA) has shown that there is an assortment of components which affect the system of taking in a second language. According to (van Daele 2005), individual differences (IDs) variables which are accessible in the midst of learners and make them able to accomplish particular levels of second language capability, in spite of the way that the conditions when the learners take in the objective language are indistinguishable. Furthermore, the individual difference variables are considered as reliable gauges of achievement in Second language acquisition, producing manifold connections with language accomplishment in classroom situations makes learners more pertinent for research (Dornyei, 2003).

The individual differences (IDs) variables can be characterized differently which also impact the language learning results. The well known and widely used categories are personality variables, cognition and effectiveness. The first category can be recognized as mental processing of information and it is also related to intelligence. Among the most routinely focused on feeling variables, one may find inspiration and demeanor. Lee (2001) proposed that 'where personality factors are concerned, they may be named having a place with the effective group or as being one of the social variables'. On the other hand, by virtue of their singularity it seems sensible to perceive an alternate social occasion of identity variables, in which introversion and extraversion proportions are on top and furthermore: nervousness, self-regard, hazard taking, resilience of equivocalness sympathy and numerous others. Many researchers like (Berry, 2007); (Van Daele, 2005); (Kiany, 1998); (Dewaele and Furnham, 1999); or believe that the ID variables of a character and the dimensions of introversion-extraversion personality help learners' ability to learn a second language.

In 1970s, some linguists proposed a theory according to which extraverts are better achievers or language learners as compared to introverts. Extraverts are more capable of practicing a language by using the data which is delivered to them (Brown, 2000), (Skehan, 1989), (Naiman, 1978). Generally, it is believed that extraverts are having obliging characteristics for the learning of a second language. According to Skehan's (1989) research, "the desirable end of the extraversion-

introversion continuum has been taken to be extraversion". Hence, in the light of this perspective, it was supposed that extraverts being high output yielders, linguistically more energetic inside the classroom and outside the classroom setting are very suitable for learning a language more rapidly as compared to introverts.

Various analysts such as (Cook, 2002), (Deary,1998), and (Eysenck, 1981) have opposite point of view, particularly as far as Psychology, that extraversion is to some degree disadvantage as far as taking in a language, the supposition centred around a strong organic grounds. This is in light of the fact that according to the personality theory of Eysenck, extraverts possess lower ability of concentration, and their concentration can be easily diverted which results by making them more weak in controlling mental diversion. Moreover, they possess limited LTM: long term memory, on the other hand, introverts possess a very strong memory (Eysenck et al., 1981:40). Such organically chose diversities are the cause of intro-extra to pose different behaviours. Additionally, Eysenck (1985) observed that the introverts are more successful in achieving scores in an achievement test as compared to extraverts.

By viewing these two contradictory angles, it can be judged that there is a disagreement between Psychologists and language specialists. Due to this way, these research studies did not deliver expected results, which could establish one viewpoint; the purpose of this research is to explore these two contradictory angles in noticeable and conclusive discoveries. In particular, this research will endeavour to reveal that how individual differences (IDs) display their influences on language proficiency of learners.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Personality Traits: Defining the Concepts**

According to Chamorro-Premuzic (2007) personality that is measured as for the most part distinctive feature of a person's uniqueness comprises a centre region for psychological studies. When thinking about this term from the linguistics point of view, it becomes apparent that the term personality is derived from a Latin word 'persona' which signifies as 'veil'. Accordingly, the investigation of identity is viewed as the investigation of "covers" which an individual wears. This idea, exceptionally wide and complex, of human identity had been translated in an assortment of routes by various analysts.

Gordon Allport, who is the writer of notion of personality, defines personality as a 'dynamic association, inside the individual, of psychophysical frameworks that make the individual's eccentric examples of conduct, considerations and emotions' in his book 'A psychological interpretation' which was published in 1937 (as referred to in Allport, 1961:11). The real supposition fundamental this idea, is that "identity makes a man's conduct not quite the same as the conduct other individuals would show in tantamount circumstances" (Hampson, 1988:2)

## **2.2 Historical Progress of Personality Theories**

Personality theory was evolved from ancient Greece, where four dispositions, to be specific melancholic, irascible, impassive and energetic get from. Two outstanding Greek hypocrites devised the temperamental theory and later on a German philosopher Immanuel Kant popularized the Galen. He contributed to the model by adding feeling and activity for the purpose of pointing out the nature of these four temperaments. Furthermore, Welhelm Wundt conducted a study and he was the one who described those four temperaments in condition of constant dimensions. According to first dimension, sanguineous and choleric are unstable. On the other hand, melancholic and phlegmatic were considered stable. According to the second dimension, neuroticism is produced by two emotional temperaments: the melancholic and the choleric as compared to the other two which were considered stable, unemotional (Eyesenck, 1981).

Another psychologist, Carl Jung who was prominent in contributing to the personality theory, he developed an assumption, later on, that assumption turned true. According to that extraversion and introversion have shared psychological basis. Further Laney (2002: 27) pointed out that Jung's theory believes that people are naturally born with an endowed temperament that bestowed us a continuum between extraversion and introversion.

## **2.3 Personality Theory of Eyesenck**

The big five model which is mostly compared with the theory of Hans Eyesenck, for his experimental studies on personality aspects, a German psychology is well-known. According to Eyesenck, personality can be effectively elaborated in terms of two factors: intro-extro and neuroticism. Though, according to the recent analytic studies by (Hampson, 1988), he anticipated the third aspect named as psychoticism-normality. He developed scientific model of personality named as PEN (psychoticism, extraversion, introversion). This model consists of many subtraits which are considered as three universal dimensions. As Deary and Matthews pointed out:

**(P) Psychoticism:** it involves the persons who are creative, manipulative, unsympathetic, anti-social, impulsive, impersonal, egocentric, cold and aggressive.

**(E) Extraversion:** it involves the persons who have the tendency to be; venturesome, expressive, sensation seeking and risk-taking, irresponsible, assertive, dominant, active and social.

**(N) Neuroticism:** it involves those persons who pretend to be; emotional, shy, irrational, and moody, tense, low-self-respect, and feeling of guilt, depressed and anxious.

It is a fact that Eysenck is the sponsor of personality dimensions. Three featured model of Eysenck is considered to be far reaching in portrayal since it gives a four-level 'progressive scientific classification of identity,' and makes an unmistakable refinement among individual levels. At the most reduced level, individual recognizable practices known as particular reactions can be found. The third level comprises of various distinctive periodic reactions; the ways people have a tendency to carry on in a specific circumstance. These ongoing reactions which may portray certain characteristics make up the following level of attributes identity. These are qualities deduced from recognizable conduct like amiability, action, reflection and numerous others. At last, at the highest point of the progressive system, at the supposed 'sort level', one may discover the as of now said three super components of Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism alluded additionally as 'higher-request variables' which are portrayed by the way that they are steady and autonomous of each other (Hampson, 1988:52). The specialists directed an expansive scale study, which included grown-up members from fifty nations. Their correlations of people inside societies affirmed the comprehensiveness of identity characteristics.

#### **2.4 Social and Behavioural Differences: Introversion versus Extraversion**

In the field of personality research, many researchers and theoreticians developed the conceptualization of extraversion and introversion. Jung was the first person who attempted to define these constructs. He was of the view that 'extraversion is the outward turning of psychic energy towards the external world' whereas, 'introversion refers to the inward flow of psychic energy towards the depths of psyche' (cited by De Raad, 2000). Extraversions are the persons who are social and they have interest in external events and external world. On the other hand, introverts are anti-social persons and they keep interest within their psyche and personality.

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Sample of study**

Random sampling was adopted as a sampling technique for the present study. Students of Master of Arts in English were randomly selected as sample according to convenience of the researcher. These students had undertaken instruction on essay writing skills and study skills in classes for six months by the respective teachers including researcher. 200 copies of Personality questionnaire were distributed to students and finally 193 students were selected for achievement test because of drop out of seven participants.

### **3.2 Research Tools**

To collect the data for this study, two research tools (i.e. a questionnaire and an achievement test of writing skills) were used.

### **3.3 Questionnaire**

Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire was used to identify personality trait of the subject (i.e. introvert, neurotic and extravert). However, only 30 items of Eysnck's personality Questionnaire were adopted and included in the questionnaire for present study. Those items which were specifically meant to measure introversion/extroversion aspect of participants' personality were selected from the original Eysnck's personality Questionnaire.

### **3.4 Achievement Test**

The achievement test comprised of an Essay writing task. The selected participants were asked to write an essay on one of the two topics; "Dialogue is a best combat to terrorism", and "Violence is last refuge to incompetence" in 40 minutes. The essay was of total 20 marks. The students' performance in the test was to be judged on the basis of Vocabulary (5 Marks), Spelling & Grammar (5 Marks), Content (5 Marks) and Expression (5 Marks). The aim was to judge their current status of proficiency in writing skills in English as a second language. 3.5 Procedure of Data Analysis. The data were analysed in two stages; at first, data based on Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire were analyzed manually by taking mean scores, thus dividing the students in three groups based on their personality traits, i.e. Extroverts, Neurotics and Introverts. Secondly, data obtained in the form of participants' scores in written test was examined by using independent sample *t*-test in SPSS. Inferences and conclusions were drawn systematically on the basis of statistics provided by SPSS.

## **4. DATA ANALYSIS**

### **4.1 Analysis of Achievement Test**

#### 4.1.1 Extravert Group

The descriptive statistics of the questionnaire showed that there were 67 extraverts.

Table 1 Gender of the Extravert Participants

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	<b>24</b>	<b>35.8</b>
	Female	<b>43</b>	<b>64.2</b>
	Total	<b>67</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table shows the gender of the participants who have extravert personality. It consists of 43 female and 24 male participants.

Table 2 Level of Proficiency in Vocabulary

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>8</b>	<b>11.9</b>	
	Average	<b>29</b>	<b>43.3</b>	
	Exceptional	<b>26</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>3.39</b>
	Good	<b>4</b>	<b>6.0</b>	
	Total	<b>67</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Table shows the scores of respondents. Level of proficiency of 8 participants is at “considerable” stage. Level of proficiency of 29 participants is at “average”. Standings on “exceptional” and “good” level of proficiency are 26 and 4 respectively. Mean score 3.39 shows overall standing at “average” point so the inference is made that performance of extravert students in vocabulary is at average level.

Table 3 Level of Proficiency in Grammar

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>12</b>	<b>17.9</b>	
	Average	<b>30</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>3.19</b>
	Exceptional	<b>25</b>	<b>37.3</b>	

---

Total	<b>67</b>	<b>100.0</b>
-------	-----------	--------------

---

Table shows the Level of proficiency of participants on grammar. 12 out of 67 are found on considerable level and average and exceptional bears 30 and 25 respectively. Mean score 3.19 indicates toward average proficiency of the participants in the field of grammar.

Table 4 Level of Proficiency in content of writing

---

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>3.75</b>
	Average	<b>20</b>	<b>29.9</b>	
	Exceptional	<b>41</b>	<b>61.2</b>	
	Good	<b>5</b>	<b>7.5</b>	
	Total	<b>67</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

---

Table shows to what extent participants are committed to follow the content while writing a manuscript. 41 out of 67 were found on exceptional level of proficiency. 20, 5, and 1 follow average, good and considerable respectively. Mean score 3.75 shows the strong affiliation towards exceptional level of proficiency.

Table 5 Level of Proficiency in expression of writing

---

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>6</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>3.79</b>
	Average	<b>12</b>	<b>17.9</b>	
	Exceptional	<b>39</b>	<b>58.2</b>	
	Good	<b>10</b>	<b>14.9</b>	
	Total	<b>67</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

---

Table shows to what extent expression of participants appeals the reader in a manuscript. 39 out of 67 were found on “Exceptional” level of proficiency. 12, 6, and 10 follow “Average”, “Good”

and “Considerable” level of proficiency respectively. Mean score 3.79 shows the affiliation towards “Good” stage in expression of their feelings and messages.

#### 4.2. Neurotic Group

The descriptive statistics of the questionnaire showed that there were 86 Neurotics.

Table 6 Gender of Neurotic participants

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	<b>38</b>	<b>44.2</b>
	Female	<b>48</b>	<b>55.8</b>
	Total	<b>86</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table shows the Neurotic population taken as sample for the study which consists of 48 female and 38 male participants.

Table 7 Level of Proficiency in Vocabulary

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>7</b>	<b>8.1</b>	
	Average	<b>28</b>	<b>32.6</b>	
	Exceptional	<b>47</b>	<b>54.7</b>	<b>3.56</b>
	Good	<b>4</b>	<b>4.7</b>	
	Total	<b>86</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Table 7 shows the level of proficiency of respondents. 47 of these are on the “Exceptional” level of proficiency, 28 are at “Average”, and 7 and 4 are at “Considerable” and “Good” level of proficiency respectively. Mean score 3.56 shows overall standing at “Exceptional” level proficiency.

Table 8 Level of Proficiency in Grammar

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>9</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>3.28</b>

Average	<b>44</b>	<b>51.2</b>
Exceptional	<b>33</b>	<b>38.4</b>
Total	<b>86</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table above shows the level of proficiency of participants on grammar. 44 out 86 are found at “Average” level, 33 and 9 are at “Exceptional” and “Considerable” level of proficiency respectively. Mean score 3.28 indicates toward “Average” level of proficiency of the Neurotic participants in the field of grammar.

Table 9 Level of Proficiency in content of writing

	Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Average	<b>20</b>	<b>23.3</b>
	Exceptional	<b>51</b>	<b>59.3</b>
	Good	<b>15</b>	<b>17.4</b>
	Total	<b>86</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 9 shows to what extent participants are committed to follow the content while writing a manuscript. 51 out of 86 were found at “Exceptional” level of proficiency. 20 and 15 are found at “Average” and “Good” level respectively. Means score 3.94 shows the strong affiliation towards “Exceptional” level of proficiency.

Table 10 Level of proficiency in expression of writing

	Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>4</b>	<b>4.7</b>
	Average	<b>18</b>	<b>20.9</b>
	Exceptional	<b>47</b>	<b>54.7</b>
	Good	<b>17</b>	<b>19.8</b>
	Total	<b>86</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 10 shows to what extent expression of participants appeals the reader in a manuscript. 47 out of 86 were found on “Exceptional” level. 18, 17, and 4 are found at “Average”, “Good” and

“Considerable” level of proficiency respectively. Means score 3.90 shows the affiliation towards “Exceptional” level of proficiency in expression in writing.

### 4.3 Introvert Group

The descriptive statistics of the questionnaire showed that there were 40 introverts.

Table 11 Gender of the Introvert participants

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Male	<b>18</b>	<b>45.0</b>
	Female	<b>22</b>	<b>55.0</b>
	Total	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 11 shows the population taken as sample for the study which consists of 22 female and 18 male participants.

Table 12 Level of proficiency in vocabulary

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>4</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>3.35</b>
	Average	<b>19</b>	<b>47.5</b>	
	Exceptional	<b>16</b>	<b>40.0</b>	
	Good	<b>1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	
	Total	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Table 12 shows the scores of respondents on choice of appropriate vocabulary. 19 of these are at the “Average” stage and 16 are at “Exceptional” level of proficiency. Standings at “Considerable” and “Good” level of proficiency are 4 and 1 respectively. Mean score 3.35 shows overall standing at “Exceptional” level of proficiency.

Table 13 Level of proficiency in Grammar

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.50</b>
	Average	<b>18</b>	<b>45.0</b>	

Exceptional	<b>21</b>	<b>52.5</b>
Total	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 13 shows the command of participants on grammar. 21 out of 40 are found at “Exceptional” level of proficiency. 18 and 1 respectively represent the standing at “Average” and “Considerable” level of proficiency. Mean score 3.50 leads towards “Exceptional” level of proficiency of the participants in the field of grammar.

Table 14 Level of proficiency in content of writing

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Considerable	<b>1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	
	Average	<b>5</b>	<b>12.5</b>	
	Exceptional	<b>21</b>	<b>52.5</b>	<b>4.15</b>
	Good	<b>13</b>	<b>32.5</b>	
	Total	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Table 14 shows to what extent participants are committed to follow the content while writing a manuscript. 21 out of 40 were found on “Exceptional” level. 13, 5 and 1 are found at “Good”, “Average” and “Considerable” level of proficiency respectively. Means score 4.15 shows the strong affiliation towards “Exceptional” level of proficiency.

Table 15 Level of proficiency in expression of writing

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Valid	Average	<b>1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	
	Exceptional	<b>28</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>4.25</b>
	Good	<b>11</b>	<b>27.5</b>	
	Total	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Table shows to what extent expression of participants appeals the reader in a manuscript. 28 out of 40 were found at “Exceptional” level of proficiency. 11, and 1, follow “Good”, and “Average”

levels respectively. Means score 4.25 shows the affiliation towards “Exceptional” level of proficiency in expression in their written messages.

#### 4.4 Tests based on Hypotheses

##### 4.4.1. Independent Sample Test: Extravert vs. Neurotic

###### Hypothesis I

Extraverts are significantly different from neurotics in proficiency in writing skill.

Table 16 Group Statistics

	Personality Trait of the Participants	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Grand	Extravert	<b>67</b>	<b>14.1194</b>	<b>1.93471</b>
	Neurotic	<b>86</b>	<b>14.6744</b>	<b>1.86889</b>

Table 17 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Grand	Equal variances assumed	<b>.582</b>	<b>.447</b>	<b>-1.795</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>.075</b>
	Equal variances not assumed			<b>-1.787</b>	<b>139.568</b>	<b>.076</b>

The *t*-test was not succeeded in proving a statistically considerable difference among the mean point/score of Extravert section has (M = 14.12, s = 1.93) and that the Neurotic section has (M = 14.67, s = 1.87),  $t(151) = -1.795$ ,  $p = .075$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ .

##### 4.4.2 Independent Sample Test: Neurotic vs. Introvert

###### Hypothesis II

Introverts are significantly different from neurotics in proficiency in writing skill.

Table 18 Group Statistics

	Personality Trait of the Participant	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
--	--------------------------------------	---	------	----------------

Grand	Neurotic	<b>86</b>	<b>14.6744</b>	<b>1.86889</b>
	Introvert	<b>40</b>	<b>15.2500</b>	<b>1.67562</b>

Table 19 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed		<b>.841</b>	<b>.361</b>	<b>-1.661</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>.099</b>
Grand	Equal variances not assumed			<b>-1.729</b>	<b>84.247</b>	<b>.087</b>

The *t*-test was not successful to prove the statistically considerable differentiation among the mean point/score of Neurotic section (M = 14.67, s = 1.87) and Introvert section (M = 15.25, s = 1.68),  $t(124) = -1.661, p = .099, \alpha = .05$ .

#### 4.4.3 Independent Sample Test: Extravert vs. Introvert

##### Hypothesis III

Introverts are significantly different from extraverts in proficiency in writing skill.

Table 20 Group Statistics

	Personality Trait of the Participant	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Grand	Extravert	<b>67</b>	<b>14.1194</b>	<b>1.93471</b>
	Introvert	<b>40</b>	<b>15.2500</b>	<b>1.67562</b>

Table 21 Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Grand	Equal variances assumed	<b>2.521</b>	<b>.115</b>	<b>-3.071</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>.003</b>

---

Equal variances not assumed	-3.184	91.526	.002
-----------------------------	--------	--------	------

---

The *t*-test was remained successful in proving statistically considerable distinction among the mean point/score of Extravert section has ( $M = 14.12, s = 1.93$ ) and that the Introvert section has ( $M = 15.25, s = 1.68$ ),  $t(105) = -3.071, p = .003, \alpha = .05$ .

## 5. FINDINGS AND RESULTS

### 5.1 Mean Score Based Findings

Extrovert learners were found at average level of proficiency in usage of vocabulary as well as grammatical structure while their content and expression styles were good enough to say it exceptional. Neurotic learners were found weak in their grammatical structure while their usage of appropriate vocabulary, correct content, and their expression were found at satisfactory level.

Neurotics were also having problem in their grammar but the other fields like usage of vocabulary, content, and expression styles were likely to be said as satisfactory. They found better than average because they are stronger in compare to Extraverts in proficiency in all four categories.

Introverts were also having problems and were lacking in usage of vocabulary. In other fields, they are better than average and sometimes exceptional. In compare to extroverts and neurotics, they were better with little difference.

The differences were little but were enough to rank all categories. Introverts were found best of all and neurotics were next. Extroverts were found at lowest level of proficiency in writing skill among the categories.

### 5.2 Hypothesis Based Findings

**Hypothesis I**, “Extraverts are significantly different from neurotics in proficiency in writing skill” was rejected because no significant difference was found among extroverts and neurotics as *P* value (.075) is greater than  $\alpha = .05$ .

**Hypothesis II**, “Introverts are significantly different from neurotics in proficiency in writing skill” was also rejected as there was no significant difference between introverts and neurotics as *P* value (.099) is greater than  $\alpha = .05$ .

**Hypothesis III**, “Introverts are significantly different from extraverts in linguistics competence in writing” was accepted as *P* value (.003) is smaller than  $\alpha = .05$ .

### 5.3 Research Questions Based Findings

The study was based on two research questions:

What is relationship between the ESL learners' personality traits and their potential for learning writing skills at master level?

It was found that there is strong relation between the personality traits of the learners and their potential for learning writing skills of English as a second language. As the descriptive statistics proved that there is significant different between the Introverts and Extraverts (see table No. 4.4.3.1 and 4.4.3.2), the answer is found.

What is the relationship between the intro-extra tendencies of the ESL learners and their performance in writing skills at master level? Descriptive statistics in the present study have revealed that a positive relationship exists between introvert personality trait and proficiency in ESL writing skills. That is introverts are better learners of writing skills than the extroverts.

### 6. CONCLUSION

It is to conclude on the basis of discussed data that introverts are better learners in writing skills. It assimilates Eysenck's theory that introvert learners are better learners of a language because of the way that they have "more mental fixation and can along these lines concentrate more on the current workload" (Van Daele 2005: 96). According to Eysenck's theory (1974), this capability makes them "the most important contender for thriving learning". The study carried by the researcher manipulate Eysenck's view appeared in 1974. It also meets Eysenck's claim that extraverts possess lower ability of concentration, and their concentration can be easily diverted which results by making them weaker in controlling mental diversion.

This study also rejects the claims of Brown (2000), Skehan (1989) and Naiman et al., (1978) who claimed that extraverts are more capable of practicing a language by using the data which is delivered to them. It is to sum it up that biologically introverts have better capability of learning, remembering due to better memory as claimed by Eysenck, (1974). Final claim, on the behalf of descriptive statistics, is that learning is associated with personality traits and the Introverts are better learners in writing skills than the Extraverts and Neurotics.

### REFERENCES

- [1]. Allport, W. G. (1937). "Personality: A psychological interpretation". New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- 
- [2]. Allport, W. G. (1961). "Pattern and growth in personality" New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- [3]. Ayub,Tariq, Abdul Ghafoor Awan and Bushra Manzoor (2016) "Call: A resource in improving pronunciation of the secondary school students in Kot Addu-Pakistan", Science International, Vol 28 (3): 2921-2927.
- [4]. Awan,Abdul Ghafoor and Yasmin Khalida (2015) "New Trends in Modern Poetry" Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics,Vol.13:63-72.
- [5]. Berry, V. (2007). Personality differences and oral test performance. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- [6].Brown, H. D. (2000). Principles of language learning and teaching. (4th edition.) New York: Longman.
- [7]. Brown, H. D., John C., King, H. V., Luther, G. E. and Wardhaugh, R (eds.). (1973). "Affective variables in second language acquisition", Language Learning 23, 2: 231-244.
- [8].Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2007). Personality and individual differences. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- [9].Cook, V. 2002. Portraits of the L2 user. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- [10].Dewaele, J. and Furnham, A.(1999). "Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistic research", Language Learning 49, 3: 509-535.
- [11].Eysenck, H.J., Eysenck M.W., Fulker, D.W., Gray, J., Levey, A.B., Martin, I., Powell, G.E., Stelmack, R.M., and Wilson, G. (1981).A model for personality. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- [12].Eysenck, J. H and Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- [13]. Eysenck, J. H. (1967). The biological basis of personality. Springfield: Thomas.
- [14]. Eysenck, J. H. (1974). Eysenck on extraversion. Oxford: Halsted Press.
- [15]. Eysenck, J. H. and Eysenck, M. W.(1985). Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach. New York: Plenum Press.
- [16]. Eysenck, J. H. and Wilson, G.(1976). Know your own personality. England: Penguin Books.
- [17].Furnham, A., Eysenck, B.G., and Saklofske, D. H.(2008). "The Eysenck personality measures: Fifty years of scale development", in: Gregory J. Boyle, Gerald Matthews and
- [18].Donald H. Saklofske (eds.), The SAGE handbook of personality theory and assessment: Personality measurement and testing. (Vol.2.) London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 197-216.
- [19]. Jang, K. M. (2001). "Eysenck's PEN model: Its Contribution to personality Psychology",

- 
- Northwestern University. (<http://www.personalityresearch.org/papers/jang.html>) (date of access 17 Nov. 2014).
- [20]. Kiany, G. R. (1998). "English proficiency and academic achievement in relation to extraversion: a preliminary study", *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 8, 1: 113-128.
- [21]. Laney, M. O. (2002). *The introvert advantage: How to thrive in an extrovert world*. New York: Workman Publishing Company.
- [22]. Laney, M. O. (2002). *The Introverted Advantage: How to Thrive in an Extrovert World*. New York, NY: Workman Publishing.
- [23]. Maltby, J, Day, L. and Macaskill, A.(2010). *Personality, individual differences and intelligence*.(2nd edition.) Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- [24]. Matthews, G. and Deary I. J. (1998). *Personality traits*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [25]. McCrae, R. R. and Terracciano, A.(2005). "Universal features of personality traits from the observer's perspective: Data from 50 cultures", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88, 3: 547-561.
- [26]. Naiman, N., Fröhlich M, Stern, H.H. and Todesco, A.(1978). *The good language Learner*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- [25]. Revelle, W. and Oehlberg, K.(2007). "Integrating experimental and observational personality research: The contribution of Hans Eysenck", *The Journal of Personality* 28: 1-15.
- [26]. Van Daele, S. (2005). "The effect of extraversion on L2 oral proficiency", *De Linguistica Aplicada a la Comunicacion* 24: 91-114.