The Impact of Discourse Analysis-based Instruction on Iranian Extroverted vs. Introverted EFL Learners' Speaking

Hossein Siahpoosh

Assistant professor, Department of English language, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

Taher Hosseinzadeh *

PhD Candidate of TEFL, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

Abstract

The main purpose of the current study was to examine the impact of discourse analysis-based instruction on Iranian extroverted vs. introverted EFL learners' speaking. Considering that in this study three classes of intermediate learners were used as the participants, a quasi-experimental design was used to answer the research questions of the study. The participants were selected from the students of English institute the Safir, west of Tehran Branches. The students were at intermediate level, and were chosen for this study because they had passed the basic courses in speaking skill. The total number of the students were 80 in the beginning. To have a group of homogeneous participants, first of all, they took an EPQ (Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire) to specify their extroversion and Introversion. Next, the participants took standard Michigan Test (1982). Calculating the mean and standard deviation of the scores, 60 intermediate level students were selected as the participants in this study. To fulfill the aims of this study, three instruments were used: a standard Michigan Test (1982), an EPQ test and speaking test. As this is a quantitative research and needs statistics to analyze the data, SPSS (Version 23) was used to gain the essential information for proving or rejecting the null hypotheses of the research. Descriptive statistics of the study may include the mean scores of the participants, standard deviation and variance of the scores in the groups. After ensuring the normality of the data through One-sample Kolmogrove-Smirnow test, the one-way ANOVA was used to analyze the data. The result of the study revealed that discourse analysis-based instruction does not have any statistically significant effect on Iranian introverted EFL learners' speaking, but it has statistically significant effect on Iranian extroverted EFL learners' speaking. Therefore, there is statistically significant differences in speaking between introverted versus extroverted EFL learners using discourse analysis-based instruction.

Keywords: Discourse analysis instruction, extroversion, introversion, speaking

* **Correspondence:** Taher Hosseinzadeh, Email: taherhoseinzadeh@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Brown and Yule (1983) stated out that speaking is the skill that the learners will be judged upon most in real-life situations. It is an important part of everyday interaction and most often the first impression of a person is based on its ability to speak fluently and comprehensively. According to this sentence, it can be inferred that speaking is an essential tool for interaction, communication and makes part of social relations. Susikaran (2012) explained that "despite the importance of speaking, researchers have shown that teaching speaking has been undervalued and English language teachers have continued to teach speaking just as a repetition of drills or memorization of dialogues" (p. 1). For this author, it is required that the goal of teaching-speaking should improve students' communicative skills, because it is the only way, learners can express themselves and learn how to follow the social and cultural roles appropriated to each communicative circumstance.

On the other hand, unfortunately some EFL students lack enough vocabulary, collocation, idioms and generally speaking proficiency. So, they have problems to produce correct L2 forms. Besides, they use inappropriate grammar and word combinations when they speak; that is, words that do not go together. As a result, their L2 speaking is not proficient. Consequently, it is advised to teach EFL students the grammar, pronunciation and right combinations of words to improve their speaking fluency in English (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010).

In this regard, the common communicative approach to speaking teaching with its emphasis on mastering communication strategies such as inference, quotation, foresight, avoidance, (except just a few), has not made any fundamental difference, as advocated by proponents (Jin, Singh & Li, 2005). In other words, this approach still lags behind in developing students' true communication skills. Of course, this inefficiency can be attributed to factors such as the limited number of class hours, lack of opportunity to interact with the natives, and low exposure to genres and types of discourse outside the classroom (Demo, 2001).

As a solution to the ineffectiveness of communicative approaches in speaking teaching, it was suggested that these approaches be combined with language teachers and other teaching professionals (curriculum developers, textbook authors, language testers) with appropriate backgrounds in discourse analysis (Olstein & Celce-Murcia, 2001).

Within the context of EFL teaching, discourse analysis can be defined as how stretches of language, considered in their full textual, social, and psychological context, become meaningful and unified for their users (Cook, 1990). Considering the fact that communicative language teaching cannot be realized fully unless language teachers are equipped with theoretical issues in discourse analysis (Olshtain & Celce-Murcia, 2001), and reconsider their perceptions on language, the next logical issue that should be addressed would be how we can put this theoretical knowledge into practice in the classrooms.

Learners have problems when learning speaking, in their pronunciation and grammar and also in using correct words in a conversation. So, the teacher needs to play an

important role. The teacher should give some corrections considering the error made by the learner. According to Fauziati (2011), error is a sign of learning made by the learners who have been learning another language and have not fully learned language system yet. When a teacher corrects learners, it may help them improve their ability in their speaking and increase their self-confidence. Therefore, giving feedback is one of the important steps in improving learners' progress in speaking. Acknowledging the limitations of communicative approaches in developing communicative competence of ESL students, Demo (2001) proposed a four-part process of Record-View-Transcribe-Analyze to study teachers' classroom interaction patterns. Furthermore, to expose learners to different discourse patterns, he encouraged teachers to make the students do discourse analysis of natural language use in different contexts enabling them to get a deeper understanding of the discourse patterns associated with a given genre or speech event as well as the sociolinguistic factors that contribute to linguistic variation across settings and contexts (p. 4).

In the other hand, the personality traits of the students have been one of the most controversial issues in the domain of second language education. Most of time methodological materials focus on the approaches of second language instruction and assessment of various skills but not many studies have been or being done to investigate the psychological issues which are involved in the process of learning a second language. Usually English teachers ignore the individual differences between their students in the classroom. This ignorance can be due to the fact that instructors might think all of the students are equal in their capability to adapt themselves to classroom teaching approaches or activities. Shyness is an important dimension of individual differences among infants, older and adults, whether it is construed as a category of temperament or as a personality trait (Crozier, 2001). The way a person thinks, feels, and behaves makes up his or her personality. Almost everyone experiences shyness on occasion (Chaudron, 2008).

Personality may be vital in this scope. Jung (1924) developed the concept that every individual has a psychological type and, in his research, he indicated that there is an extroverted type and an introverted type. Informed by Carl Jung's thinking, Myers and Myers (1995) adapted his work to help individuals understand their preference for either extroversion or introversion. There are distinctions between extroversion and introversion as: people who prefer extroversion attend to the outside world, giving and receiving their energy there by interacting with people and the environment. They are likely to prefer to communicate and work out ideas by talking. They prefer to learn through doing and talking it through with others. They tend to have a wide variety of interests and to take the initiative in work and in relationships. They tend to be sociable and express themselves well. People who prefer introversion focus their energies on their inner world of ideas and experiences. They get their energy from their inner world through reflection. They tend to prefer communication through writing and to work out ideas through reflection. This is also their preferred way to learn. People who prefer introversion tend to be private. They will take the initiative in things that are very important to them (Myers & Myers, 1995).

These extroversion-introversion (E-I) differences have an impact on how students become engaged during speaking and using strategies, the actions or steps they take to learn and understand speaking, and the way they process information. When considering the needs of students, extroverts require a high level of stimulation to remain interested while introverts work best when given time to reflect and process before engaging in classroom activities (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 2009).

Therefore, based on what mentioned earlier This study is going to help EFL teachers to choose an effective way in speaking teaching by investigating the impact of discourse analysis-based instruction on Iranian extroverted vs. introverted EFL learners' speaking. This study is aimed at providing English teachers with a productive method of teaching English at schools and institutes across Iran.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Alsoraihi (2019) conducted a study to about bridging the gap between discourse analysis and language classroom practice. This research paper supports the fact that language cannot be learned or taught in isolation. Effective language learning/teaching requires learners to be engaged in actual/social contexts in order to apply their knowledge and skills for achieving a successful communication which is the ultimate goal of learning a language. This paper discusses various associated applications of discourse analysis in language classrooms in an attempt improve the quality of language teaching/learning techniques and outcomes. The researcher also reviews the most prominent challenges that hinder the effective implementation of this approach and provide certain solutions that can be used in order to overcome these challenges. This paper assumes that learners who focus on relating linguistic knowledge to social and cultural contexts will demonstrate high levels of communicative performance and self-confidence.

Fauzan (2017) conducted a study about inducing critical discourse analysis in speaking syllabus for EFL students of Indonesian Islamic universities. This study used content analysis and thematic analysis as the research design. The study involved speaking lecturers, students of speaking course, and head of English language education of IAIN Samarinda as research subjects. Data on syllabus documents were obtained from the document analysis and data on the subjects' perceptions were collected using interviews and questionnaire. The study revealed that speaking courses were revised their names as: speaking for daily conversation, speaking for formal settings, speaking for academic settings, speaking for academic purposes, and public speaking. Three primary characteristics of the renewal speaking sources were termed: learning outcomes, needs analysis-based course contents, and CDA inductions.

Tabrizi, Gupta and saxena (2014) conducted a study about discourse analysis in the ESL classroom. This article attempts a user-friendly definition of discourse analysis. By defining it in this manner, the authors hope to encourage teachers to use it in their ESL classrooms. To this end, they suggest certain concrete measures that bring discourse analysis into the ESL classroom. They concluded that it is time that language teachers give up on undermining the scope and impact of discourse analysis and give it its due weightage in terms of   usage   and employability. Language teachers, especially,

second language teachers can use it not only as a research method for evaluating their own teaching practices but also as a valuable classroom strategy for studying interaction among language learners.

Khabiri and Haji maghsoodi (2012) conducted a study about the effect of discourse analysis-based instruction on Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension. For this purpose, the researchers utilized a Preliminary English Test (PET) in order to homogenize the participants and select a sample of pre-intermediate students from 96 EFL students at a language school in Yazd, Iran. Sixty-four students who scored one standard deviation above and below the sample mean were selected and randomly divided into two groups of control and experimental, each with 32 students. One of the researchers taught reading comprehension to both groups with the only difference that discourse analysis-based reading instruction was utilized in the experimental group focusing on macro level, micro level, and overall discourse comprehension. At the end of the treatment, both groups took part in a reading post-test and the results of the ANCOVA led to the rejection of the null hypothesis with a large effect size.

Rashidi and Rafieerad (2010) studied classroom discourse in EFL classrooms. It was revealed in their study that there were not obvious differences between male and female teachers. But boys interact with their teachers more than girls. Another finding of the study was students' initiation in classroom exchanges by asking questions and when the teacher responded their answers, they follow up this response. So, the IRF pattern was more Student-Teacher Talk.

Chambers (2007) conducted a study named language learning as discourse analysis: implications for the LSP learning environment. He concluded that it is easy to envisage an environment where LSP teachers can adopt a discourse-based approach to teaching, studying individual texts in detail as has traditionally been the case, and complementing this with corpus data to make the learners aware of recurrent patterns of use.

Based on the literature about the discourse analysis-based instruction, the following research questions of the research is raised:

- *Q1*: Does discourse analysis-based instruction have any statistically significant effect on Iranian introverted EFL learners' speaking?
- *Q2*: Does discourse analysis-based instruction have any statistically significant effect on Iranian extroverted EFL learners' speaking?
- *Q3:* Are there any statistically significant differences in speaking between introverted versus extroverted EFL learners using discourse analysis-based instruction?

Based on the research question, the null hypothesis is presented:

- *H1:* discourse analysis-based instruction does not have any statistically significant effect on Iranian introverted EFL learners' speaking.
- *H2:* discourse analysis-based instruction does not have any statistically significant effect on Iranian extroverted EFL learners' speaking.

- *H3:* There is no statistically significant differences in speaking between introverted versus extroverted EFL learners using discourse analysis-based instruction.

METHOD

Based on the nature of this study, quantitative research is to be the most appropriate one and the quasi-experimental method has been used to accept or reject the research hypothesis. The participants were selected from the students of English institute the *Safir*, west of Tehran Branches. The students were at intermediate level, and were chosen for this study because they had passed the basic courses in speaking skill. The total number of the students were 80 in the beginning.

Before starting the data collection process, the students were informed by the researcher of the procedure, and the aims of the research. The students were ascertained that their scores on different tests would be completely confidential, and if they would like to know the results of their performance, they would be informed through their e-mails. Therefore, the researcher planned to meet the participants in eight weeks, twice a week to give the tests.

To have a group of homogeneous participants, first of all, they took an EPQ (Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire) to specify their extroversion and Introversion. Next, the participants took standard Michigan Test (1982). Calculating the mean and standard deviation of the scores, 60 intermediate level students were selected as the participants in this study. They were divided in three groups; one control group, one introverted experimental group, and one extroverted experimental group. Each group included 20 students.

Instruments and Procedures

Some instruments were used, in order to accept or reject the research hypothesis. In the first session, a standard Michigan Test (1982) was administered to the students. According to the scores students gained from this test, the range of scores was known. After homogenizing the students, the EPQ test was administered to recognize the extroversion and introversion of EFL learners. Before the administration of the questionnaire, all the participants were briefed about the guidelines in answering the questionnaires. They were asked if they are willing to participate in the study by answering a questionnaire. The participants were guided accordingly on how they answered the forms: (1) The researcher gave the rationale of the study, (2) read the questions carefully; (2) instructed that there are no right or wrong answers for the questionnaires.

The researcher informed the participants that the study needs to get authentic answer for more accurate result leading to finding group patterns, not individual-student patterns. The participants were also made aware that their answers will not affect their class standing in institute and failure to follow the guidelines will be forfeited on the participation in the study. They were encouraged to respond honestly to each statement in the questionnaire and to ask questions about any aspect of the questionnaire they do

not understand. The researchers then scored the questionnaires for each subscale. Each participant was assigned with a call number used for the purpose of identifying and recording all the instruments and keeping their names confidential. In short, the following outline delineates the steps taken to better administer EPQ:

- ✓ Distributing copies of the questionnaire to each student

- ✓ Asking students to provide identifying information in the spaces provided.

- ✓ Reading the directions aloud and work through the example provided with the students.

- ✓ Discussing the response options and making sure the students understand the rating scale.

- ✓ Asking if anyone has questions about any aspect of the questionnaire

- ✓ Instructing the students to read each statement carefully and circle the appropriate responses.

- ✓ Encouraging students to work at their own pace.

Based on the results of the mentioned test, the participants were divided into three groups: a control group, an extroverted experimental group, and an introverted experimental group. After division, the speaking test was held in order to record the pretest. The speaking test was based on This American Life. This test which was administered as pretest and posttest targeted the following sub-skills: (1) discourse management: coherence and cohesion devices by reading about a given situation then choosing the best response orally; (2) making the best choices for real-life situations by providing contextually appropriate responses orally after reading four personalized situations which are described in a few sentences and end with a question; (3) pronouncing words correctly and with appropriate intonation; and (4) engaging in an interview with the examiner. It should be noted that the scores were also out of 20.

Then the control group instructed traditionally and discourse analysis instruction was done considering the speaking in the experimental groups. The discourse analysis instruction included by three items namely Macro level, Micro level, and Overall comprehension of discourse (based on Tomlinson, 2003; McCarthy & Carter, 2003; Wenquan, 2009).

At 'Macro level', the students were given the opportunity to understand the main content and rhetorical organization of discourse before speaking about title. The teacher assisted the students in this regard by developing their background knowledge. Note has to be made that for this purpose the students would not speaking about title. Therefore, the teacher first activated the students' background knowledge by asking some questions about the topic. Then, the students were encouraged to predict the content and organization on verbal clues. At this stage, the students were encouraged to discuss their predictions with their peers. The students were also asked to speak at least 10 words they expected to find in the topic as one of the steps in the prediction phase and for this they brainstormed as many words as they could and were free to use dictionaries. The

students would then check the title quickly to see whether their predictions were in line with what appeared in the topic.

Afterwards, at 'Micro level', students focus was on both grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion with the components and subcategories explained earlier in this section. Furthermore, the teacher practiced with the students how to analyze each section of their speaking in order to understand it by means of its thematic structure, cohesive devices, and the overall coherence. The new vocabularies were not taught but the students were encouraged to guess the meaning of unknown words with explanations being provided only when misunderstanding occurred.

Finally, at the stage of 'Overall comprehension of discourse', the students engaged in various activities such as finding the topic sentence and main ideas, inferring the speaker's implied meaning, finding the most appropriate title, evaluating the speaker's attitude toward the topic, and expressing their own stance towards the topic rather than simply accepting that of the speaker. At the end, the students were assigned to speak about the topic at home, pose some questions, and prepare a short lecture for the next session. At the end of the treatment, all groups took part in the speaking post-test and the researchers compared the achievement of the experimental and control groups through an ANCOVA by SPSS v.23.

RESULTS

To ensure the homogeneity of the three groups, the Michigan English Test was administered among 80 students. A common level between the majorities of the students was the criterion. It should be mentioned that the scores were calculated out of 80. Descriptive statistics for this homogeneity test is represented below.

Table 1. Case Processing Summary

	participants	Cases					
		Valid		Missing		Total	
		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
SPT	1.00	80	100.0%	0	0.0%	80	100.0%

Table 1 shows us the number of people in statistical society and also the percentage of participants. Those students (N = 60) whose scores fell within the range of one standard deviation above and below the mean (score between 53 and 63) were chosen as participants for this study. Descriptive statistics for this homogeneity test is represented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of MET

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
Scores of OQPT	80	30.00	38.00	78.00	622	77.83	32.518	-.114	.269	.537	.532
Valid N (listwise)	80										

As it can be seen in the Table 2 the maximum and minimum scores of the participants were 38 and 78. Therefore, the scores within one standard deviation above and below

the mean (score between 53 and 63) were chosen for the research. The study included variables such as extroverted discourse analysis-based instruction, introverted discourse analysis-based instruction and traditional instruction. To obtain the goal, the researcher tested the null hypotheses stated on the basis of the research questions.

Table 3. Number of Statistical Population

	Group	N
1	extroverted discourse analysis-based instruction	20
2	introverted discourse analysis-based instruction	20
3	traditional instruction	20

The descriptive statistics for the pretest is given in the Table 4 It should be mentioned that the scores were calculated out of 20.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for the Pretest of the Three Classes

Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
	20	18.65	1.040	17	20
2	20	14.75	2.552	10	20
3	20	16.35	2.231	11	20
Total	60	16.58	2.580	10	20

Their scores on the pre-test were compared with each other using the one-way ANOVA. The results of the used one-way ANOVA and the descriptive statistics for the speaking performance of all the three selected groups are presented in the following tables:

Table 5. ANOVA for the Pretest

	df	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2	0.94	.000
Within Groups	57		
Total	59		

 As it can be seen, the obtained value for F between is 2 and for F within 57; therefore, the case for denominator is 0.94. Because such a value is less than the critical value for F (2, 57), it can claimed that the differences between the speaking performances of all the three groups on the pre-test were not statistically significant. In fact, all the groups belonged to the same population at the beginning of the study and before starting the treatments for each group. The average of Class 1 was 18.65, average of Class 2 was 14.75 and Class 3 was 16. 35. Therefore, there were differences between averages of three groups.

Table 6. Multiple Comparisons of the pretests of three classes

(I) reduction	(J) reduction	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	3.900*	.000	2.03	5.77
	3	2.000*	.034	.13	3.87
2	1	-3.900*	.000	-5.77	-2.03
	3	-1.900*	.046	-3.77	-.03
3	1	-2.000*	.034	-3.87	-.13
	2	1.900*	.046	.03	3.77

The research question of the current study is Does discourse analysis-based Instruction have any significant Impact on Iranian extroverted vs. introverted EFL learners' speaking? And if so, are there any statistically significant differences in speaking between introverted versus extroverted EFL learners using discourse analysis-based Instruction?

In order to answer the first part of the research question, the speaking performances of all of the three groups on the post-test were compared with each other. The descriptive statistics for performances of all of the three groups have been given in the table 7.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for the Performance of All Groups in the Posttest

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
1	20	18.90	.912	17	20
2	20	16.25	2.173	13	20
3	20	17.40	2.437	15	20
Total	60	17.52	2.213	13	20

As it can be seen, there were differences between the mean scores of groups 1, 2, and 3. The mean scores were as:

 M1 = 18.90, M2 =16.25 and M3 = 17.40. In fact, M1 > M3 > M2.

As it can be seen in the table 4.9, the best speaking performance (based on the mean) was that of group 1 that is the extroverted group, in which discourse analysis instruction was used, the next one is group 3, in which traditional instruction was used. And the least performance in area of speaking was that of group 2, i.e. introverted EFL learners. In order to make sure if such differences were significant or not, the one-way ANOVA was used. The results of the applied one-way ANOVA are given in the table 8.

Table 8. ANOVA for the Posttest

	df	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2	9.219	.000
Within Groups	57		
Total	59		

The obtained value for $F_{(2, 57)} = 9.219$. Because this value is greater than the critical value ($F = 3.09$) for F with these degrees of freedom, this conclusion can be drawn that the differences between the mean scores for the three groups of the study on the post-test were statistically significant. Accordingly, it is revealed that discourse analysis-based Instruction for extroverted and introverted learners, has significant effects on the Iranian EFL learners' speaking.

As one-way ANOVA showed that differences between the performances of the three groups on the post-test were significant, then our concern would be to identify where these differences exactly lied. In other words, which group performed differently from other two groups? In order to answer this question, the Scheffe test as a post hoc test was run to see where the differences exactly were. Multiple comparisons which have been made using Scheffe test as a robust Post Hoc Test are presented in table 9.

Table 9. Multiple Comparisons (scheffe) of posttests of three classes

(I) reduction	(J) reduction	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	2.650*	.000	1.09	4.21
	3	1.500	.061	-.06	3.06
2	1	-2.650*	.000	-4.21	-1.09
	3	-1.150	.187	-2.71	.41
3	1	-1.500	.061	-3.06	.06
	2	1.150	.187	-.41	2.71

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 10. Scheffe Test for posttest

reduction	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
2	20	16.25	
3	20	17.40	17.40
1	20		18.90
Sig.		.187	.061

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 20.0

As it can be observed in the above table, the differences between the mean scores for comparison of Groups 1 & 2 was significant. However, the difference between the mean scores for the comparison of groups 2 & 3 and Groups 1 & 3 were not significant. Accordingly, it can be concluded that students in group 1 performed better on the post-test speaking test compared with those subjects in groups who were taught L2 language learning through traditional method and the introverted group. Also it is observed that although there was an apparent difference between the mean scores for comparison of Groups 2 & 3, it should be noted that the class of traditional method did not have statistically significant difference from the class of introverted learners, but the EFL learners of group 3 performed better than learners of group 2.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, it was attempted to understand the impact of discourse analysis-based instruction on Iranian extroverted vs. introverted EFL learners' speaking with the statistical computing software (SPSS). First of all, the homogeneity of the subjects through Michigan English test and normality of test were analyzed. Then pretest was analyzed through one-way ANOVA. The analysis showed that differences between the performances of all the three groups on the pre-test were not statistically significant. With a looking at ANOVA analysis of posttest, the issue became clear that students in group 1 performed better on the post-test speaking test compared with those subjects in groups who have been taught speaking through traditional method and the introverted group.

Teaching and learning a second language is one of the things that has always been of interest to second language enthusiasts from the distant past and has attracted a lot of

methods. Teaching a second language based on discourse analysis is a new method that the authors have developed based on four steps: taking the frequency of words and different structures of speaking. Required language skills, application of teaching methods of discourse analysis and error analysis and focus on problematic issues in exercises. Teaching based on discourse analysis, in addition to general functions, also has special functions and roles. One of the most obvious features of this type of teaching method is that it is not necessary to design and apply different teaching methods for learners of different countries with different languages. In addition, it simultaneously increases the learner's reading, speaking, comprehension and writing skills.

On the other hands, for many years, researchers have been examining and revising teaching methodologies to discover ways that can facilitate second language learning on student's part. On the way to this expedition, they started looking for reasons that are responsible for that why some students are better at language learning than others.

 One of the factors discovered by the researcher is the individual differences of the learners. The learning styles, strategies, age, aptitude, and attitude towards the language learning, motivation, and learner's personality are all important factors varying from person to person and hence, are somewhat responsible for poor or better learning of the second language.

 In the eyes of many language teachers, the personality of their students is a major factor contributing to success or failure in language learning. In order to determine how important, they rated personality and two other individual differences, Griffiths (1991), for example, piloted a survey of 98 teachers of ESL/EFL in England, Japan, and Oman. He reported a mean rating of four on a five-point scale_ slightly higher than rating for intelligence and just below that for memory. Learners also consider personality factor important. According to Naiman et al. (1978), found that of the 'good language learners', 31 percent believed that extroversion was helpful in acquiring oral skills. According to Jung (1924), every individual has both personality traits introversion and extroversion but one trait is more prominent than the other. The terms are a bit archaic as extroversion is not about being loud and introversion is not about being shy. It is about where people get their energy and motivation from other people or themselves.

The findings of the current study provide support for the strategic approach toward L2 speaking (by considering the role of context and learner's personalities) and suggest that the pedagogical framework of raising EFL students' knowledge of speaking through discourse analysis instruction can help improve their speaking proficiency. The findings of this study can be considered as helpful guidelines for the teachers, learners, and syllabus designers. First, the teachers can be aware that in speaking, the introverts may have more problems than extroverts, so they will perform weaker than extroverts. Thus, teachers can prepare such learners with more practice of speaking in this mode, which is to provide them with exercises to write compositions on speaking, introducing them the general frame of speaking in this mode, and then teach them how to discuss their attitudes in different topics. Moreover, the learners will be aware of their weaknesses and strengths in speaking skill, and their performance in different modes of speaking. At this level of proficiency, the learners have less problems for the conveyance of meaning, but

they should practice more on the form of their speaking. In other words, they should focus on the application of their language knowledge and its mechanics as well as their attention to the conveyance of meaning. Further, the textbooks should provide English teachers and students with opportunities to let them apply the learned strategies in authentic and naturalistic settings.

REFERENCES

Alsoraihi, M. H. (2019). Bridging the Gap between Discourse Analysis and Language Classroom Practice. *English Language Teaching*, *12*(8), 79-88.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(4), 207-217.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge university press.

Carter, R. (2003). Language Awareness. *ELT journal*, *57*(1), 64-65.

Chambers, A. (2007). Language learning as discourse analysis: Implications for the LSP learning environment. *ASp. la revue du GERAS*, (51-52), 35-51.

Chaudron, L. (2008). The effectiveness of second language strategy instruction: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, *61*(4), 993-1038.

Cook, G. (1990). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Crozier, G. (2001). Hard to reach parents or hard to reach schools? A discussion of home—school relations, with particular reference to Bangladeshi and Pakistani parents. *British Educational Research Journal*, *33*(3), 295-313.

Demo, D. A. (2001). *Discourse analysis for language teachers* (Report No. ED456672). ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics Washington DC. ERIC Digest. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Fauzan, U. (2017). *Inducing critical discourse analysis in speaking syllabus for EFL students of Indonesian Islamic Universities*.

Fauziati, E. (2011). Interlanguage and error fossilization: a study of Indonesian students learning English as a foreign. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 23-38.

Jin, L., Singh, M., & Li, L. (2005). *Communicative language teaching in China: Misconceptions, applications and perceptions*. A paper presented at AARE 05 Education Research. Parramatta, Sydney

Khabiri, M., & Hajimaghsoodi, A. (2012). The Effect of Discourse Analysis-based Instruction on Iranian EFL Learners" Reading Comprehension. *American Journal of Scientific Research*, *66*, 23-36.

McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2014). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teaching*. Routledge.

Myers, I., & Myers, P. B. (1995). Gifts differing: Understanding personality type. *Language Learning, 3*(11), 42-63.

Myers, I., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (2009). MBTI Manual; A guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Instrument. *Journal of Personality*, *5*(3), 25-41.

Olshtain, E., & Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 707ñ 724). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Rashidi, N., & Rafieerad, M. (2010). Analyzing patterns of classroom interaction in EFL classrooms in Iran. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *7*(3).

Susikaran, R. (2012). *The role of a teacher in improving speaking skills through classroom activities.* Retrieved on July 24th, 2014, from: http://www.oiirj.org/oiirj/nov-dec2012/22.pdf

Tabrizi, A. R. N., Gupta, D., & Saxena, M. (2014). Discourse analysis in the ESL classroom. *Beyond Words*, *2*(1), 72-89.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Developing materials for language teaching*. A&C Black.