

Indonesian EFL Students' Proficiency in Writing and Ability in Speaking across Personality Learning Styles

Bambang Yudi Cahyono¹ & Ira Mutiaraningrum^{2*}

¹ English Department, Universitas Negeri Malang, East Java, Indonesia

² English Department, Tanjungpura University of Pontianak, West Kalimantan, Indonesia

* Ira Mutiaraningrum, E-mail: ira.mutiaraningrum@gmail.com

Abstract

This research aimed at examining Indonesian EFL students' proficiency in writing and ability in public speaking across personality learning styles: extroversion and introversion. It involved 74 undergraduate students who took an Essay Writing course in the English Department of Universitas Negeri Malang, one of the leading universities in Indonesia. The students were distributed into three classes. They were taught how to write essays. Then, the students were made aware that they had to complete two tasks: writing and presenting a cause and effect essay on topics related to English language teaching. The students' cause and effect essays were scored to know their proficiency in writing and their presentation was assessed to know their ability in speaking. Two scoring rubrics were used and two raters were involved in the scoring process for interrater reliability. The results of the research showed that the Indonesian EFL students' proficiency in writing is strongly related to their ability in speaking for both groups of students. In addition, the Indonesian extrovert EFL students' proficiency in writing is strongly related to their ability in speaking. The Indonesian introvert EFL students' proficiency in writing is also strongly related to their ability in speaking. However, there is no significant difference of the proficiency in writing and ability speaking between the extrovert and introvert students.

Keywords

Indonesian EFL students, proficiency in essay writing, ability in public speaking, learning styles

1. Introduction

Learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) are required to learn four English language skills in order to master the language. The four English skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—are related by two parameters: the mode of communication, namely oral or written, and the direction of communication, namely productive and receptive skills (Aydoğan & Akbarov, 2014). Aydoğan and Akbarov (2014) described listening as the receptive skill in the oral mode, reading as the receptive skill in the written mode, speaking as the productive skill in the oral mode, and writing as the productive skill in the written mode. These four skills are inevitably connected and it is difficult to use each of them

separately for communicative purposes. This is also the case in the context of teaching of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Teaching one skill will go hand in hand with another skill. Therefore, students' ability in one skill may be related to their ability in other skills.

Among the four skills in English, writing in particular, is commonly given less attention due to the emphasis in the need to study a second or foreign language for communication (Harmer, 2001). Whereas, in reality writing activities can be integrated tightly to the other three skills, especially in academic English. Students' proficiency in writing is often correlated with their ability in listening and in reading (Al-saadat, 2004; Fatemi, 2008). This is because students can get language input from listening and reading. For instance, a study by Fatemi (2008) showed that there was a significant correlation between students' proficiency in writing and their ability in reading. A study by Al-saadat showed that reading and writing are mutually reinforcing skills (Al-saadat, 2004). This means that students who have high proficiency in writing are likely to have a high ability in reading.

Proficiency in writing is also related to ability in speaking. Research shows that students' high proficiency in writing helps them speak more effectively (Huy, 2015). Some researchers view speaking and writing as similar forms in which some discourses in a written form are also acceptable in a spoken form (Rokni & Seifi, 2014). Both speaking and writing are productive skills that require the speakers/writers to put their ideas into a written or spoken discourse. Proficiency in writing and ability in speaking are said to be directly proportional, meaning that when the proficiency in writing increases, the ability in speaking also increases. However, most of the research studies done regarding the correlation among skills mainly focus on the relation between receptive skills and productive skills. Since writing and speaking are both productive skills, little is known regarding the relationship of those two skills, especially in the context of EFL teaching in Indonesia.

Apart from the belief that those who write well can speak better, good ability in speaking does not depend only on proficiency in writing. The exposure towards a foreign language plays a big role in students' ability in speaking. Input-poor environment for spoken communication in English is said to contribute to students' difficulty in speaking English (Gan, 2012). As a result, low ability in speaking makes students shy in speaking English (Bashir, Azeem, & Dogar, 2001). Students often feel tension, apprehension, nervousness, and excessive worry when it comes to anxiety-provoking class such as oral exam (Bozavli & Gulmez, 2012). In this respect, the paramount problems of tension, nervousness, anxiety, and insecurity in speaking English are rooting in students' lack of preparation. Therefore, it is essential for the students to prepare and practice themselves, commonly with a written draft to prepare them well. Another major cause of students' inconvenience in oral performance is the arousal of the autonomic nervous system (Spielberger, 1983). This often is related to students' personality learning styles.

Personality can be defined as aspects of an individual's attitudes, thoughts, beliefs, feeling, behaviors, and actions (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Personality is believed as inborn, unique temperament and features arising in different situations and characteristics and qualities of people which separate them

from other people (Eysenck, 1967; Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, 1996; McAdams & Pals, 2006; Phares, 1991). It is the differences possessed by individuals which are claimed to contribute to one's second language acquisition (Hajimohammadi, 2011). There are two types of students based on their personality learning styles: extrovert and introvert students. People become extrovert or introvert in different degree (Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012). The term "extrovert" defines a person who is more sociable and interactive. They therefore are more confident in oral spoken presentation (Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012). On the other hand, "introverts" are less likely to talk and have lower self-confidence and may be better suited for writing skills (Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012). They like to keep their ideas to themselves until they have thought them through. They can be very uncomfortable when being made to speak about something they are not sure about. In addition, introverts need to recharge themselves by having quiet reflective time in brainstorming ideas (Harris, Sadowski, & Birchman, 2006).

Some studies showed that personality learning styles contribute to students' writing skills. Students who are taught on the basis of the personality learning styles resulted in better achievement than those who are not taught on the basis of personality learning styles (Ahmed, 2012). Extrovert students are claimed to be better language learners (e.g., Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012). Extrovert students who tend to be sociable seem to maximize the language-use opportunities as they are more talkative and inclined to engage in conversations (Zafar & Meenakshi, 2012). They also find it easier to obtain more language input and get more practice in using the language (Shahila & Meenakshi, 2012). On the other hand, a study by Nejad, Bijami and Ahmadi (2012) aiming at exploring the role of individual differences in terms of extroversion and introversion on EFL learners' writing ability reveals that personality learning styles have no significant impact on proficiency in writing. In separate studies, some research has revealed that personality learning styles appear to have no significant effect on learners' progress in writing (Hajimohammadi, 2011; HemmatNezhad, Jahandar, & Khodabandehlou, 2014; Marefat, 2006). The latter results implied that extrovert and introvert students have the capability to be proficient in writing skill.

Since extrovert students are believed to outperform introvert students in oral production and introvert students are assumed to be better in writing tasks, we sought to gauge how these two personality learning styles would affect students' writing and speaking skills. It has become a well-known fact that people who prepare written drafts before speaking perform better than those who speak spontaneously; those who write better can speak better. However, there has not been any study investigating how these two productive skills are correlated. Reflecting upon the gaps of research in the relationship between proficiency in essay writing and ability in public speaking, especially among Indonesian EFL students, this research is aimed to examine:

- 1) How Indonesian EFL students' proficiency in writing relates to their ability in speaking,
- 2) How proficiency in writing relates to ability in speaking among Indonesian extrovert and introvert EFL students,
- 3) Whether or not there is a difference in the Indonesian EFL students' proficiency in writing and

ability in speaking across personality learning styles.

2. Method

The research examines the relationship between Indonesian EFL students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking across personality learning styles which are extroversion and introversion. It involved 74 undergraduate students who took *Essay Writing* course in the English Department of Universitas Negeri Malang, one of the leading universities in Indonesia. The *Essay Writing* course is one of the three writing courses offered in the English Department. The other two courses are *Paragraph Writing*, which is intended to train the students to write good paragraphs and *Argumentative Writing* which aims to help students write their essays and refute other people's arguments. The Paragraph Writing course, which is taught in the second semester, is the prerequisite of the Essay Writing course which is given in the third semester, and the Argumentative Writing course is taught in the fourth semester of the four years of undergraduate education. The Essay Writing course aims to help students write essays of five types of development: exemplification, comparison and contrast, classification, process analysis, and cause and effect essays.

The 74 students were distributed into three classes: Class A (25 students), Class B (26 students), and Class C (23 students). Out of the five types of essay development, this research deals with the teaching of how to write cause and effect essays in particular to the three classes of students. The students in the three classes were taught how to write cause and effect essays separately. The materials for teaching how to write cause and effect essays were taken from Smalley, Ruetten and Kozirev's (2001) *Refining Composition Skills: Rhetoric and Grammar*, the main book used in the course. The materials included theoretical explanation about cause and effect essay of three different types: single cause with multiple effects, multiple causes with a single effect, and causal chain. The teaching of how to write cause and effect essays was divided into 2 stages: the writing stage and the speaking stage. The two teaching stages are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The Teaching and Learning Activities

Stage	Meeting	Teacher	Students
The Writing Stage	1	Introducing the theory on cause and effect essay and its development.	The students were involved in group works and asked to discuss cause and effect phenomena in the nature or in the society. They were given freedom to choose their own topics.
	2	Asking the students to discuss sample cause and effect essays.	The students were asked to watch a video of speaking performances and PowerPoint slides which contain cause and effect phenomena. The students were asked to develop their

		introductory and first developmental paragraph 1.
3	Checking the students' introductory and first developmental paragraphs. Asking the students to read a model text on Regular Aerobic Exercise.	The students showed their introductory and first developmental paragraphs. The students read the model text on <i>Regular Aerobic Exercise</i> (Smalley et al., 2001, p. 262). The students were asked to write the second developmental paragraph.
4	Checking students' second developmental paragraph. Asking the students to read a model text on Upsetting the Balance Nature.	The students showed their second developmental paragraph. The students read the model text on Upsetting the Balance Nature (Smalley et al., 2001, p. 265). The students were asked to write the last developmental paragraph and the concluding paragraph.
5	Checking the last developmental paragraph and the concluding paragraph. Assigning students to work on causal chain phenomena.	The students showed the last developmental paragraph and the concluding paragraph. The students were asked to discuss causal chain and analyze natural causal chain phenomena which included mount eruption, frog metamorphosis, water cycle and butterfly metamorphosis.
6	Collecting students' essay. Asking the students to have discussion on causal chain in the society.	The students were involved in group discussion on their dreams (i.e., what they would like to be or to do when they have a job with a good salary). Each of the groups was asked to present their dreams in front of the class.
The speaking stage	7-12 Evaluating each of the students' presentations.	The students were asked to present their topics (for one session four to five students presented their PowerPoint slides).

At the beginning of the period in the teaching of how to write cause and effect essays, the students were made aware that they had to complete two tasks: writing a cause and effect essay on topics related to

English language teaching and presenting their essays in front of their classmates. The essays written by the students included the following titles: *Indonesian Students' Difficulties in Memorizing Tenses*; *How Listening to English Songs Help in Improving Students' English Skill*; and *The Effects of Learning Literature for English Department Students*. More titles of the students' essays are shown in Appendix A.

The data were derived from students' scores in cause and effect essays and their scores in presentations. To ensure that the scores obtained were the accurate representations of students' capability, we, both, served as raters in assessing students' essays and presentation performances. We practiced in scoring some of the students' essays first to reach agreement in the components of proficiency in essay writing and those of ability in public speaking. Then, we discussed the reasons for differences in the results of scoring of some of the students' essays and presentation performances. In case that each of us gave scores which are far different for a particular student, the average score was used for the student.

The rubric used to score the students' essays was adopted from the rubric developed by Jacobs, Zinkraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel and Hughey (1981) which they labeled as "ESL Composition Profile". This profile can be used to mark the students' essays by considering five components of writing, each of which has its weighting. They are content (30), organization (20), vocabulary (20), language use (25), and mechanics (5). Evaluation of content was based on aspects such as the students' knowledgeable and relevant ideas regarding the topic. The organization deals with how the ideas in the essays are coherently and clearly expressed. Vocabulary measures the students' variety and appropriateness in the use of words and expressions. Language use deals with sentence constructions and frequency of errors in the essay. Mechanical aspects include punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The maximum score possible for students' essays is 100.

The instrument used for measuring the speaking performance was adapted from Napa Valley College's (n.d.) sample scoring rubrics for presentations. Unlike the original version of the rubric in the adapted version, we added language use component because the instrument was used to measure the speaking performances of EFL students. The rubric has some categories and weightings: content (40), organization (20), language use (20), and presentation style (20). The content category deals with the substance and relevance of ideas in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end of presentation. Organization concerns how the ideas are arranged in the introduction, in the middle part of presentation, and in the conclusion. Language use covers language aspects which include pronunciation, fluency, accuracy, and vocabulary. Presentation style consists of aspects which include eye contact, gesture, voice quality, length of presentation, and the use of audio visual aids. The instrument used for measuring speaking performance is shown in Appendix B.

The Questionnaire on Personality Learning Styles was developed on the basis of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised-Abbreviated (Karancı, Abdel-khalek, Glavak, Richter, Bridges, Dirik, Yorulmaz, Van der Ende, Eisemann, & Arrindell, 2006), Eysenck Personality Questionnaire EPQ (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964), and The Maudsley Personality Inventory (Jensen, 1958). Out of many items which are

contained in the three source questionnaires, 29 items were selected by considering the suitability for each of the learning styles and appropriateness with the Indonesian culture. The questionnaire items categorize students into extrovert and introvert students. The Questionnaire on Personality Learning Styles is shown in Appendix C.

The students' scores in essays and in presentations were analyzed in order to know how their proficiency in writing were correlated to their ability in speaking across personality learning styles. The students' scores in the two productive skills were correlated by using Statistical Package for Social Studies (SPSS) program. In addition, the students' scores were compared across their personality learning styles.

3. Results

The results of the study are presented according to the order of the research questions. The presentation begins with the results of the correlation of the students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking in general, the correlation of the students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking across personality learning styles, and ends with the differences of proficiency in writing and ability in speaking across personality learning styles.

3.1 Correlation between Proficiency in Writing and Ability in Speaking

In order to know the correlation between the students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking, linear regression test was applied with a consideration. That is, there is a direction in the results of analysis from the proficiency in writing to ability in speaking. There was a conviction on the part of the researchers that proficiency in writing was likely to affect speaking rather than the opposite direction. For the analysis we needed to find out the distribution of the scores of the students. For this purpose, one sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied. The result is shown in Figure 1.

Table 2. Test of One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Writing and Speaking Scores

		Writing	Speaking
N		74	74
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	79.2432	78.9865
	Std. Deviation	5.20750	6.97254
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.612	1.194
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.848	.116

Note: a. Test distribution is Normal,

b. Calculated from data.

Table 1 shows the scores of the 74 students in writing and speaking. The mean of the students' scores in writing is 79.24 and the mean of the students' scores in speaking is 78.98, with the difference .26. The statistical analysis results in Z .61 for writing and Z 1.19 for speaking. The result of *p* for both writing

and speaking are more than .05, with writing .84 and speaking .12. This means that the scores of the students are distributed normally for the two productive skills. Because the scores were distributed normally, further analysis was run to know the correlation coefficient of the proficiency in writing and ability in speaking. The result is shown in Table 2.

Table 3. Correlation between Extrovert Students' Proficiency in Writing and Ability in Speaking

Model	Adjusted r		Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig. (p)
	r	r Square		
1	.658a	.433	.425	5.28874

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), writing,

b. Dependent Variable: speaking ($p \leq .05$).

Table 2 depicts that there is a correlation between students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking indicated by $p = .00 \leq .05$. Correlation coefficient (r) varies from -1 (perfect negative correlation) to 1 (perfect positive correlation). To interpret the coefficient correlation level in the present study, we use the range of $r = 0-0.2$ as no or very weak correlation, $r = 0.2-0.4$ as weak correlation, $r = 0.4-0.6$ as moderate correlation, $r = 0.6-0.8$ as strong correlation, and $r = 0.8-1.0$ as very strong to perfect correlation (Salkind, 2000). Thus, $r = .658$ means that the correlation between proficiency in writing and ability in speaking is in the strong level. This suggests that if the students' proficiency in writing is high, the students' ability in speaking is also high. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .433$) indicates that 43.3% of the variance of speaking score can be explained by the proficiency in writing. It implied that 43.3% of the total changes in students' speaking ability are determined by their proficiency in writing.

3.2 Correlations between Students' Proficiency in Writing and Ability in Speaking across Personality Learning Styles

To answer research question 2, statistical analysis was used to find out the correlations between proficiency in writing and ability in speaking for the extrovert and introvert students. The mean of extrovert students' scores in writing is 78.96 and the mean of extrovert students' scores in speaking is 78.80. Before finding out the correlation coefficients of proficiency in writing and ability in speaking, we applied the statistical analysis of one-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov for both extrovert and introvert students. The statistical analyses show that the Z for proficiency in writing of 61 extrovert students is .723 and the Z for ability in speaking is 1.047. The result of p for both extrovert students' writing and speaking are more than .05, with writing .67 and speaking .22. The scores of the students are distributed normally for both skills. Therefore, the analysis of the correlation between extrovert students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking can be conducted. The result is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Model Summary of the Correlation between Extrovert Students' Proficiency in Writing and Ability in Speaking

Model	Adjusted r		Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig. (<i>p</i>)
	r	r Square		
1	.646 ^a	.418	.408	5.27798

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), writing,

b. Dependent Variable: speaking ($p \leq .05$).

Table 4 depicts that there is a correlation between extrovert students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking which is indicated by $p = .00 \leq .05$. The correlation coefficient (r) = .646 indicates that the correlation between extrovert students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking is in the strong level. This suggests that if the students' proficiency in writing is high, it is likely that the students' ability in speaking is also high. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .418$) shows that 41.8% of the variance of extrovert students' speaking scores can be explained by their proficiency in writing. It can be implied that proficiency in writing determined 41.8% of the total changes in extrovert students' speaking.

After the correlation of extrovert students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking was computed, the correlation between proficiency in writing and ability in speaking for introvert students was computed. The mean of proficiency in writing of introvert students is 80.53 and that of ability in speaking of the same students is 79.84. The statistical analysis of one-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov for introvert students shows that the Z for proficiency in writing of 13 introvert students is .57 and the Z for ability in speaking is .71. The result of p for both introvert students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking are more than .05, with writing .89 and speaking .69. Therefore, the scores of the students are distributed normally and the analysis of the correlation between introvert students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking can be done. The analysis of the correlation between introvert students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Model Summary of the Correlation between Introvert Students' Proficiency in Writing and Ability in Speaking

Model	Adjusted r		Std. Error of the Estimate	Sig. (<i>p</i>)
	r	r Square		
1	.718 ^a	.515	.471	5.61786

Note: a. Predictors: (Constant), writing,

b. Dependent Variable: speaking ($p \leq .05$).

Table 5 shows the correlation between proficiency in writing and ability in speaking of introvert

students. It is indicated by $p = .006 \leq .05$ which describes the correlation between introvert students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking. This suggests that if the introvert students' proficiency in writing is high, the students' ability in speaking is also high. The R square value ($R^2 = .515$) indicates that 51.5% of the variance of introvert students' speaking scores can be explained by their proficiency in writing. The coefficient of determination (R^2) .515 suggests that the level of introvert students' ability in speaking is accounted for by their proficiency in writing by 51.5%.

3.3 The Difference in Proficiency in Writing and Ability in Speaking across Learning Styles

In order to answer research question 3, the differences in the proficiency in writing and ability in speaking across personality learning styles were found out. To do so, the first step was to know whether the students from each personality learning style were homogenous. For this purpose, Levene test for equality of variances was used. The Levene test for proficiency in writing across personality learning styles shows that the data are homogenous ($p = .502 > .05$). The same test was applied to know whether or not the scores in speaking across personality learning styles are homogenous. The results show that the data are homogenous ($p = .538 > .05$).

In light of the results of the homogeneity test for the scores in writing as well as scores in speaking, for the extrovert and introvert students, it can be stated that all of the groups of students across personality learning styles were homogenous. Therefore, further analysis can be conducted to find out the differences between extrovert and introvert students in the two productive skills, namely writing and speaking.

To examine the difference between proficiency in writing across personality learning styles, independent sample t-test was computed to compare the values of the means from writing scores and speaking scores. The result of the comparison is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Comparison of Writing Scores of the Extrovert and Introvert Students

Personality Learning Style	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Significant Value
Extrovert	61	78.9672	5.27563	.67547	.327
Introvert	13	80.5385	4.85825	1.34744	

Note: ($p \leq .05$).

Table 6 shows that there is no significant difference between the writing scores of extrovert and introvert students. The p -value is .327 which is bigger than .05 ($p > 0.05$) indicates that there is no differences of students' proficiency in writing between the extrovert and introverts students.

To know the difference between ability in speaking across personality learning styles, another independent sample t-test was computed to compare the values of the means of the students' scores. The result of the comparison is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Comparison of Speaking Scores of the Extrovert and Introvert Students'

Personality Learning Style	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Significant Value
Extrovert	61	78.8033	6.85765	.87803	.628
Introvert	13	79.8462	7.72276	2.14191	

Note: ($p \leq .05$).

Table 7 shows that there is no significant difference between the writing scores of extrovert and introvert students. The p -value is .628 which is bigger than .05 ($p > 0.05$) which attests that there is no differences of students' proficiency in writing between the extrovert and introverts students.

4. Discussion

The discussion of the results are arranged on the basis of the order of the research questions. The discussion starts with the the correlation of the students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking in general, the correlation of the students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking across personality learning styles, and ends with the differences of the students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking across personality learning styles.

The results of the first research question revealed that there is a positive high correlation between students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking ($r = .658$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .433$) implied that students' speaking ability is determined by their proficiency in writing. In other words, the students' proficiency in writing reinforces their ability in speaking. The result of this study suggests that students with high proficiency in writing speak better than those who have moderate proficiency in writing.

Students' proficiency in writing is a good predictor to ability in speaking considerably. A study by Blake (2009) delineates the impact of students' proficiency in writing to their ability in speaking in which oral fluency improvement is possible through a writing program. Writing is a good way to help students develop their ability in using the language along with the vocabulary and grammar. Writing scaffolds students' speaking accuracy and fluency. Better writing proficiency is linked with accurate grammar use, longer responses, and complex syntactic construction (Cumming, Kantor, Baba, Eouanzoui, Erdosy, & James, 2005). Some studies investigating the impact of dialog journal writing on EFL students' speaking also revealed that writing can improve students' oral production, speaking accuracy and fluency and encourage effective oral communication (Bagheri & Pourgharib, 2013; Rokni & Seifi, 2014). Writing which provides longer time to construct the sentences enables students to pay attention to their choices of vocabulary and grammar. Therefore, the students found it easier to speak after writing a draft in the form of their essays. This yielded high correlation between the students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking. Hence, it can be stated that speaking activity which is preceded by writing helps students produce speech with better accuracy and fluency for effective

communication.

These findings affirmed the findings of HemmatNezhad et al. (2014) showing that there is a correlation between students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking. HemmatNezhad et al. (2014) reported that students' frequent writing practices affect their ability in speaking. Writing is apt to make students better thinkers in which they elaborate their thoughts. It could in turn improve their speaking skill (El-Koumy, 1988). Writing and speaking as productive skills share the same nature of representing ideas and thoughts onto language, be it in the form of written or spoken discourse. In writing which is a process of discovery, the writers are struggling to think, compose and put their ideas together to meet the readers' expectation (Ismail, 2011). This process also happens in speaking which requires the speakers to formulate speech based on their thoughts to address the interlocutors. The more the students write their ideas in a written form, the easier they put their ideas into the spoken form. In short, the finding of this study examines the idea presentation process in writing as a practice for students in representing their ideas into spoken discourse.

The results of the study also show the correlation of extrovert and introvert students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking. First, the correlation between proficiency in writing and ability in speaking of extrovert students resulted in strong correlation ($r = 0.646$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .418$) indicates that proficiency in writing of extrovert students determined their speaking ability. This study finds out that proficiency in writing has impact on extrovert students' ability in speaking, meaning that the better the extrovert students' proficiency in writing, the better their ability in speaking. On the other hand, correlation between proficiency in writing and ability in speaking of introvert students also showed that there is a high correlation between the two productive skills ($r = 0.718$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .515$) implied that the level of the introvert students' ability in speaking is accounted for by their proficiency in writing. Thus, the proficiency in writing of introvert students predicts their ability in speaking. To summarize, proficiency in writing impacts students' ability in speaking in respect to their personality learning style.

Interestingly, although the correlation of extrovert students' proficiency in writing and ability in speaking is high, the scores of extrovert students' writing ($\bar{x} = 78.96$) are slightly higher than their speaking scores ($\bar{x} = 78.80$). This might be explained by the characteristics of extrovert students who are outgoing and they speak more spontaneously. Extrovert students tend to have greater respond to external stimuli (Burtăverde & Mihăilă, 2011). Conversely, in classroom presentation which is a solitary activity requires students to write and speak on their own. This somehow surmises that extrovert students will be better speakers when they can draw energy from socializing with people. In contrast with the extrovert students, introvert students are likely to be better in writing and less able in speaking. The scores obtained by introvert students in writing ($\bar{x} = 80.53$) is higher than the scores obtained in speaking ($\bar{x} = 79.84$). In writing, students had the opportunity to express themselves on their own without being embarrassed about their limits of their language (El-Koumy, 1988). Their reserved characteristic did not impede them to perform better in writing and this therefore helps them

speak. All in all, it is proved that students' proficiency in writing is a good predictor of their ability in speaking for both extrovert and introvert students.

The results of analysis to answer the third research question showed that there is no significant difference between extrovert and introvert students in terms of their proficiency in writing and ability in speaking. The significant value of the comparison between the writing scores of extrovert students and the writing scores of introvert students was .327. This signifies that there is no difference between extrovert and introvert students in terms of their proficiency in writing. This finding is consistent with the previous studies exploring the role of individual differences in terms of extroversion and introversion on writing skill of EFL learners that personality types appear to have no relationship with writing proficiency (Hajimohammadi, 2011; Marefat, 2006; Nejad et al., 2012). The next computation of the comparison of speaking scores of the extrovert and introvert students resulted in significant value .628. It means that there is no difference of ability in speaking between the extrovert and introvert students. This is in contrast with the finding of the study conducted by Abali (2006) which showed that students with extroversion produce longer sentences and self-corrected utterances than the introvert students. The findings of this study shows no difference between the extrovert and the introvert students although the extrovert students are more inclined to speak up, to participate in class, and to make use of opportunities to use language outside the classroom (Rashidi, Yamini, & Shafiei, 2011). In short, both extrovert and introvert students have the same chance to write and speak better.

To summarize, this study has shown the relation between the two English productive skills namely writing and speaking which have not been much examined before. The present study suggested that good proficiency in writing leads to better ability in speaking. This study also clarified the stereotype that extrovert students are better speaker is not the case of speaking for presentation. This characteristic does not help much in the case of speaking for presentation since the weighting of the scores relies heavily on the content of the presentation rather than the presentation skill itself. Hence, this study proved that students have an equal chance to be proficient in both writing and speaking regardless their personality traits.

5. Conclusion

This article has reported the result of the examination of the relation between Indonesian EFL students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking across personality learning styles. In general, the results show that there are strong correlation between Indonesian EFL students' proficiency in writing and their ability in speaking. Both the proficiency in writing of the extrovert students and introvert students strongly correlate with the ability in speaking of the two groups of students. The results of the study suggest that good proficiency in writing leads to better ability in speaking regardless of the students' personality learning styles. This implies that in the classroom, English teachers are expected to train the students to write well in order to help them speak in a more proficient way. This is especially important for the teaching of the two productive skills in the English department of universities in

Indonesia, where writing and speaking courses are taught as separate courses. Additionally, further research might be conducted to investigate which components of writing contribute more than the others in the improvement of the Indonesian EFL students' ability in speaking.

The results of this study also show that there is no significant difference between the Indonesian EFL extrovert and introvert students with regard to their writing and speaking skills after some periods of teaching. This is evident from the comparison of the means of the scores of the extrovert students and the introvert students in their proficiency in writing and ability in speaking. This insignificant difference between the extrovert and introvert students in their writing and speaking skills should be considered as an advantage in the teaching of productive skills. This is because English teachers do not have to know at the first place whether the students in their classes belong to the extrovert or introvert types of students. Accordingly, the English teachers can apply various types of teaching and learning strategies in handling either writing or speaking courses. Other research studies can also focus on other types of learning styles which may affect proficiency in writing and ability in speaking of the English department students in the EFL contexts beyond Indonesian.

References

- Abali, F. (2006). *The effect of personality traits extroversion/introversion on verbal and interactive behaviors of learners*. A master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Ahmed, O. N. (2012). The effect of different learning styles on developing writing skills of EFL Saudi learners. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 5(2), 220-233.
- Al-Saadat, A. I. (2004). Investigating the Relationship of Reading and Writing Abilities in the English language program at King Faisal University. *Scientific Journal of King Faisal University*, 5(1), 215-228.
- Aydođan, H., & Akbarov, A. (2014). The four basic language skills, whole language and integrated skill approach in mainstream University classrooms in Turkey. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(9), 672-680. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n9p672>
- Bagheri, S., & Pourgharib, B. (2013). An investigation of the effect of journal writing on EFL learners' oral production. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(11), 3520-3525.
- Bashir, M., Azeem, M., & Dogar, A. H. (2001). Factor effecting students' English speaking skills. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 34-50.
- Blake, C. (2009). Potential of text-based internet chats for improving oral fluency in a second language. *Modern Language Journal*, 93(2), 227-240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00858>
- Bozavli, & Gulmez. (2012). Turkish students' perspectives on speaking anxiety in native and non-native English speaker classes. *US-China Education Review*, 12, 1034-1043.
- Burtăverde, V., & Mihăilă, T. (2011). Significant differences between introvert and extrovert people's simple reaction time in conflict situations. *Romanian Journal of Experimental Applied Psychology*, 2(3), 18-24.

- Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Baba, K., Erdosy, U., Eouanzoui, K., & James, M. (2005). Differences in written discourse in independent and integrated prototype tasks for next generation TOEFL. *Assessing Writing*, 10, 5-43.
- El-Koumy, A. S. A. (1998). *Effect of dialog journal writing on EFL students' speaking skill*. Available in ERIC database.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The biological basis for personality* (Vol. 689). Transaction Publisher.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1964). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory*. London: University of London Press.
- Fatemi, M. A. (2008). *The relationship between writing competence, language proficiency and grammatical errors in the writing of Iranian TEFL sophomores*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University Sains Malaysia.
- Gan, Z. (2012). Understanding L2 speaking problems: Implications for ESL curriculum development in a teacher training institution in Hong Kong. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 42-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2012v37n1.4>
- Hajimohammadi, R. (2011). Impact of self-correction on extrovert and introvert students in EFL writing progress. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 161-168.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Essex, UK: Pearson Education.
- Harris, L. V., Sadowski, M. A., & Birchman, J. A. (2006). A comparison of learning style models and assessment instruments for university graphics educators. *Engineering Design Graphics Journal*, 70(1), 6-14.
- HemmatNezhad, S., Jahandar, S., & Khodabandehlou, M. (2014). The impact of extraversion vs. introversion on Iranian EFL learners' writing ability. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 4(1), 119-128.
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J. & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist*, 51(5), 469-477. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.51.5.469>
- Huy, N. T. (2015). Problems affecting learning writing skill of grade 11 at Thong Linh high school. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 53-69.
- Ismail, S. A. A. (2011). Exploring Students' Perceptions of ESL Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 73-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p73>
- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Jensen, A. R. (1958). The Maudsley Personality Inventory. *Acta Psychol*, 14, 314-325.
- Karanci, A. N., Abdel-khalek, A. M., Glavak, R., Richter, J., Bridges, K. R., Dirik, G., ... Yorulmaz, O. (2006). *Extending the cross-national invariance of the parental warmth and rejection dimensions: Evidence from Arab countries, Croatia, and Turkey by applying the short-EMBU*. Paper presented at the 1st Congress of International Acceptance and Rejection, Askeri Müze Kültür Merkezi,

Istanbul-Turkey.

Marefat, F. (2006). Student writing, personality type of the student and the rater: Any interrelationship? *The Reading Matrix*, 6(2), 116-124.

McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new Big Five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, 61(3), 204.

Napa Valley College. (n.d.). *Sample scoring rubrics for presentations*. Retrieved November 10, 2015, from <http://www.napavalley.edu/people/briddell/Documents/BIO105/OralPresentationScoreCards151201.doc>

Nejad, A. M., Bijami, M., & Ahmadi, M. R. (2012). Do personality traits predict academic writing ability? An EFL case study. *English Linguistics Research*, 1(2), 145-152.

Phares, E. J. (1991). *Introduction to psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Rashidi, N., Yamini, M., & Shafiei, E. (2011). Oral communication apprehension and affective factors: Self-esteem and Introversion/Extroversion. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 5(7), 145-174.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). London: Longman.

Rokni, S. J. A., & Seifi, A. (2014). Dialog journal writing and its effect on learners' speaking accuracy and fluency. *Study in English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 28-37.

Salkind, N. J. (2000). *Statistics for people who think they hate statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smalley, R. L., Ruetten, M. K., & Kozyrev, J. R. (2001). *Refining composition skills: Rhetoric and grammar*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychological Press.

Zafar, S., & Meenakshi, K. (2012). A study on the relationship between extroversion-introversion and risk-taking in the context of second language acquisition. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 1(1), 33-40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2012.v1i1.42>

Appendix A. Examples of Students' Titles for Cause and Effect Essays

No.	Student Name	Title
1	AL	The effects of extensive reading on improving students' reading comprehension.
2	BDS	Increase your vocabulary by watching English movie.
3	MAA	Indonesian Students' Difficulties in Memorizing Tenses.
4	NS	Cross Cultural Misunderstanding that Happen In Indonesian Students.
5	RAR	How listening to English song help in improving students' English skill.
6	ARF	The Causes Why ELT Students Get Bored Easily in Grammar Class.

7	EJD	Why Indonesian Students are less Interested in Reading.
8	IR	The Effects of Learning Literature for English Department Students.
9	RT	The Causes of ELT Students' Anxiety during Speaking Test.
10	RAD	What Makes Students Fail Grammar Class.
11	GW	How study online improve your English skill.
12	PNH	Why listening subject is difficult for some students.
13	IGN	How High Stress Level Influences Student's capability to Learn Language.
14	RKG	The Effects of Using Digital/Mobile Phone Dictionary for Students.
15	SBN	Why Reading Short Story Can Help Us to Learn English.

Appendix B. Scoring Rubric for Presentation

Category	No.	Scoring Criteria	Total Points
Content (40 points)	1	Introduction is attention-getting, lays out the problem well, and presents a thesis for the rest of the presentation.	8
	2	Citations/evidence/examples are introduced and attributed appropriately.	8
	3	Material included is relevant to the overall message/purpose.	8
	4	Materials are presented with no or limited use of cards for reference (no text book or the printed essay).	8
	5	There is an obvious conclusion summarizing the presentation.	8
Organization (20 points)	6	The purpose of the presentation is clear.	5
	7	Main points are clear and detailed.	5
	8	Information is presented in a logical sequence.	5
	9	The conclusion relates back to introduction.	5
Language (20 points)	10	Pronunciation (phonetically correct, intelligible).	5
	11	Fluency (effortless, smooth flow of speech).	5
	12	Accuracy (no major grammatical error).	5
	13	Vocabulary (incorporates wide range of vocabulary).	5
Presentation (20 points)	14	Speaker maintains good eye contact and is appropriately acted (e.g., gestures, moving around, etc.) to keep the audience engaged.	5
	15	Speaker uses a clear, audible voice (well-communicate).	5
	16	Length of presentation is within the assigned time limits.	5
	17	Audio/visual/video components are readable and clear to support the main points of the presentation.	5
Score		Total Points	100

Appendix C. Personality Learning Style Questionnaire

Personality Learning Style Questionnaire

1. Respondent' Data:

a) Name:

b) Gender: Male/Female (Cross one)

c) Age:

2. Direction:

a) We kindly ask your willingness to answer all questions.

b) Give checklist (√) to one of the columns (Yes or No) according to your condition.

c) Please answer according your true condition, the results of this questionnaire will not affect your score.

No	Statement	Yes	No
1	I enjoy meeting new people.		
2	I am a talkative person.		
3	I am rather lively.		
4	I easily get some happiness into a rather dull situation.		
5	I am mostly the center of conversation when I am with other people.		
6	My mood often goes up and down.		
7	I like doing things in which I have to act quickly.		
8	I nearly always have a 'ready answer' when people talk to me.		
9	I often take on more activities than the time I have.		
10	I can get a party going.		
11	I like plenty of excitement around myself.		
12	Other people think of me as being very lively.		
13	I usually take the initiative in making new friends.		
14	I like telling jokes and funny stories to my friends.		
15	I like to get along with people.		
16	I have many friends.		
17	I like meeting people more than reading.		
18	I have many different hobbies.		
19	I can easily get bored to my routine.		
20	I speak the truth although it hurts.		
21	I would be very unhappy if I were prevented from making numerous social contacts.		
22	I am happiest when I get involved in some project that calls for rapid action.		

23	I generally prefer to take the lead in group activities.		
24	I am ordinarily a carefree individual.		
25	I usually take the initiative in making new friends.		
26	I prefer action to planning my action.		
27	I often have “a time of my life” at social affair.		
28	I ever change from happiness to sadness, or via versa without good reason.		
29	I like to have jokes with others.		