UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTROVERSION/EXTRAVERSION AND L2 READING PROFICIENCY OF ARAB UNDERGRADUATES

MEDJEDEL KHAOULA

FBMK 2016 69

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTROVERSION/EXTRAVERSION AND L2 READING PROFICIENCY OF ARAB UNDERGRADUATES

By

MEDJEDEL KHAOULA

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

October 2016

COPYRIGHT

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of
the requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTROVERSION/EXTRAVERSION AND L2
READING PROFICIENCY OF ARAB UNDERGRADUATES**

By

MEDJEDEL KHAOULA

October 2016

Chairman   **: Associate Professor Wong Bee Eng, PhD**
Faculty   **: Modern Languages and Communication**

Personality types have a great influence on our lifestyle, attitudes and preferences, as
well as our way of learning and academic performance. In the literature, research on
introversion/extraversion correlation to reading is insufficient and exposed contradicted
findings as well. Therefore, this study tries to draw conclusions about the relationship
between introversion/extraversion and L2 reading proficiency for Arab undergraduates.
And the key issue that has to be considered in this study is investigating which function
pair that represent the mental functions (NT, NF, SF or ST) of introversion/extraversion
performs the highest reading proficiency score. The present study examines personality
types of L1 Arab undergraduates who are ESL learners. Next, the learners' reading
proficiency levels in English were associated with their personality types. Further, the
function pairs of both introverts and extraverts that contribute to the highest score of L2
reading proficiency were determined for the learners. This study is anchored on three
main theories. From a psychological perspective, Carl Jung's theory (1923) of
Psychological Types which is based on natural preference, is adopted. The theory further
posits that these preferences, when used properly, lead to competence and success in the
field of education. In addition, Hans Eysenck's (1967) approach of the biological basis
of personality gives a physiological explanation that guides introversion/extraversion
preferences. With regard to reading, David Rumelhart's (1977) interactive model of
reading comprehension is adopted to explain the process of reading comprehension and
hence, reading proficiency. This model claims that reading includes the use of both
higher mental operation and the lower text processing. Participants for the study were
randomly selected from the College of Business Administration in Taibah
University,Saudi Arabia. Two instruments were used to collect the required data for the
study. The first was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a self-report
questionnaire that helped the participants to determine their personal qualities. The
MBTI contains four bipolar dimensions that classify people as either extravert or
introvert, thinking or feeling, sensing or intuitive, and judging or perceiving. The second
instrument was an English reading test (TOEIC Bridge), which was used to determine
the reading proficiency level of the ESL learners. In this test, learners used their
knowledge of English grammar, usage, vocabulary as well as reading skills to answer

i

the questions. The data from the reading component of the test was used for the study to find the association between the learners' reading proficiency in English and their personality type. The collected data was used to address the following research questions: a) Which is the most dominant personality type among L1 Arab undergraduates? b) What is the relationship between students' introversion and extraversion and their L2 reading proficiency? and c) What are the function pairs of introverted and extraverted types that represented the highest scores of L2 reading proficiency? The findings of the study showed that introversion is the dominant personality type among business ESL undergraduates. Also, no statistically significant relationship between introversion/extraversion and reading proficiency was found. However, the highest reading scores were accompanied with NT and NF function pairs.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Master Sastera

HUBUNGAN ANTARA INTROVERSI/EKSTRAVERSI DAN KECEKAPAN MEMBACA L2 DALAM KALANGAN PRASISWAZAH ARAB

Oleh

MEDJEDEL KHAOULA

Oktober 2016

Pengerusi : **Profesor Madya Wong Bee Eng, PhD**
Fakulti : **Bahasa Moden dan Komunikasi**

Jenis personaliti mempunyai pengaruh yang besar ke atas gaya hidup, sikap dan keutamaan, di samping cara pembelajaran dan prestasi akademik seseorang. Dalam sorotan kajian, penyelidikan tentang korelasi introversi/ekstraversi terhadap membaca adalah tidak mencukupi dan menggambarkan dapatan yang berkontradik juga. Oleh sebab itu, kajian ini diharap dapat menarik beberapa kesimpulan tentang hubungan antara introversi/ekstraversi dan kecekapan membaca L2 bagi prasiswazah Arab. Isu utama yang diambil kira dalam kajian ini adalah untuk menyelidiki fungsi pasangan manakah yang mewakili fungsi mental (NT, NF, SF atau ST) introversi/ekstraversi yang menunjukkan skor kecekapan membaca yang paling tinggi. Kajian ini meneliti jenis personaliti prasiswazah L 1 Arab yang merupakan pelajar ESL. Seterusnya, tahap kecekapan membaca mereka dalam bahasa Inggeris dikaitkan dengan jenis personaliti mereka. Tambahan lagi, fungsi pasangan kedua-dua introvert dan ekstravert yang menyumbang pada skor tertinggi kecekapan membaca L2 telah ditentukan bagi pelajar tersebut. Dari perspektif psikologikal, teori Jenis Psikologikal Carl Jung (1923) yang berdasarkan keutamaan semula jadi telah diterima pakai. Teori ini selanjutnya menunjukkan bahawa keutamaan tersebut, sekiranya digunakan sebaik-baiknya, membawa pada kompetensi dan kejayaan dalam bidang pendidikan. Di samping itu, pendekatan asas biologikal personaliti Hans Eysenck (1967)memberikan penjelasan fisiologikal yang membawa kepada keutamaan introversi/ekstraversi. Berkaitan dengan membaca, model interaktif pemahaman membaca David Rumelhart (1977) telah diguna pakai bagi menjelaskan proses pemahaman membaca dan juga , kecekapan membaca. Model ini memperuntukkan bahawa membaca termasuk penggunaan kedua-dua operasi mental dan juga pemprosesan teks bawah. Responden bagi kajian ini telah dipilih secara rawak dari Kolej Pentadbiran Perniagaan di Universiti Taibah, Arab Saudi. Dua instrumen telah digunakan untuk mengumpul data bagi kajian ini. Pertama ialah Indikator Jenis Myers-Briggs (MBTI), soal selidik swalaporan yang membantu responden untuk menentukan kualiti personal mereka. MBTI mengandungi empat dimensi bipolar yang mengklasifikasikan manusia sebagai sama ada ekstravert atau introvert, pemikir atau perasa, sensitif atau intuitif, dan penilai atau penanggap. Instrumen kedua ialah ujian membaca bahasa Inggeris (TOEIC Bridge), yang digunakan

untuk menentukan tahap kecekapan membaca pelajar ESL. Dalam ujian ini, pelajar menggunakan pengetahuan tatabahasa, penggunaan, kosa kata bahasa Inggeris mereka di samping kemahiran membaca bagi menjawab soalan. Data komponen membaca dari ujian telah digunakan dalam kajian ini untuk melihat perkaitan antara kecekapan membaca pelajar dalam bahasa Inggeris dan jenis personaliti mereka. Data yang dikumpul telah digunakan untuk menjawab soalan penyelidikan berikut: a) Jenis personaliti manakah yang lebih dominan dalam kalangan prasiswazah L1 Arab ? b) Apakah hubungan antara introversi dan ekstraversi pelajar dan kecekapan membaca L2 mereka c) Apakah fungsi pasangan jenis introvert dan ekstravert yang mewakili skor tertinggi kecekapan membaca L2? Dapatan kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa introversi merupakan jenis personaliti yang dominan dalam kalangan prasiswazah ESL perniagaan. Di samping itu, tidak terdapat hubungan yang signifikan secara statistik antara introversi/ekstraversi dan kecekapan membaca. Walau bagaimanapun, skor membaca tertinggi didapati disertai dengan fungsi pasangan NT dan NF.

iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation and its completion would not have been possible without the efforts of several individuals. Specially, I would like to express my gratitude to Associate Prof. Dr. Wong Bee Eng for her willingness to take time away from her busy schedule to serve on my dissertation committee. Her research expertise, academic excellence, and literary skills were invaluable to me. Having the opportunity to work and interact with her has been a rewarding experience, and her willingness to assist and guide me during my dissertation is sincerely appreciated.

Also, I would especially like to thank Dr. Pabiyah Toklubok, my co-supervisor. She provided encouragement, practical advice and steered me in the right direction whenever I needed it.

Finally, I must express my very profound gratitude to my parents, Ahmed and Rashida. Their support and care helped me overcome setbacks and stay focused on my graduate study. Also, I would like to offer my special thanks to my sister El Khansaa and her husband Ahmed for their patient guidance, enthusiastic encouragement and useful critiques of this research work. Finally, I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to my brother and sisters for their unfailing support and continuous encouragement throughout my years of study and through the process of researching and writing this thesis. I deeply appreciate their belief in me.

I certify that a Thesis Examination Committee has met on 25 October 2016 to conduct the final examination of Medjedel Khaoula on her thesis entitled "Relationship between Introversion/Extraversion and L2 Reading Proficiency of Arab Undergraduates" in accordance with the Universities and University Colleges Act 1971 and the Constitution of the Universiti Putra Malaysia [P.U.(A) 106] 15 March 1998. The Committee recommends that the student be awarded the Master of Arts.

Members of the Thesis Examination Committee were as follows:

Wan Roselezam binti Wan Yahya, PhD
Associate Professor
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Rosli bin Talif, PhD
Associate Professor
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Khazriyati Salehuddin, PhD
Associate Professor
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Malaysia
(External Examiner)

NOR AINI AB. SHUKOR, PhD
Professor and Deputy Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 27 December 2016

vi

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of the Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Wong Bee Eng, PhD
Associate Professor
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Pabiyah Hajimaming @ Pabiyah Toklubok, PhD
Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

ROBIAH BINTI YUNUS, PhD
Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

vii

Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:
- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software

Signature: _____ Date: _____

 Name and Matric No.: Medjedel Khaoula, GS 41054

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:
- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) were adhered to.

Signature:
Name of Chairman
of Supervisory
Committee: Associate Professor Dr. Wong Bee Eng

Signature:
Name of Member
of Supervisory
Committee: Dr. Pabiyah Hajimaming @ Pabiyah Toklubok

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MBTI   The Myers and Briggs Type Indicator

I   Introversion

E   Extraversion

S   Sensing

N   iNtuitive

T   Thinking

J   Judging

TOEIC   The Test of English for International Communication

L1   First/native Language

L2   Second/acuired Language

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preamble

This chapter presents the research background of the study. First, it introduces an overview of personality types and literacy as a part of language learning. Next, the main theories that underpin this research will be briefly outlined. Then, the problem statement, aim and objectives and the research questions are espoused. Finally, the significance of the study is discussed.

1.2 Background of the Study

Personality is a set of qualities that reflects *what* people say, *how* they do and what they do as a way of putting "a unique stamp on their action'' (Carver & Scheier, 2012, p.2). The American psychologist Allport (1961) defined personality as "a dynamic organization, inside the person, of psychophysical systems that create the person's characteristic patterns of behaviour, thoughts, and feelings" (Carver & Scheier, 2012, p.4). Modern psychological study of personality flourished throughout the early decades of the 20th century basing its essence on the three 19th century intellectual themes: individualism, the unconscious, and the huge emphasis on measurement. Despite the inconsistency between the three themes, those themes constructed the field of personality psychology.

Individualism emphasised the importance and uniqueness of individuals. Burckhardt (as cited in Barenbaum & Winter, 2008, p.2) confirmed that people in the middle ages recognised themselves "only as a member of a race, people, party, family, or corporation - only through some general category" (Burckhardt, 1954, p.101) and only after the Renaissance, people started to consider themselves as Individuals.

The concept of Unconsciousness was the next to emerge as a revolution against the concept of the 'Age of Reason' of the 18th century. The Unconscious was subsequently distinctly addressed in the literature of personality psychology integrated with Freud's internal debate (id) concepts. Today, the unconscious is thought to be an implicit but crucial part of many important processes that lead to the realisation of consciousness (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977; Bargh, 1982; Kihlstrom, 1990; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Yet, an absolute concentration on the unconscious may provoke negligence or underestimation of the explicit behaviour and rational planning (Cantor & Zirkl, 1990). Personality psychology followed the steps of exact sciences that were popular in the 19th century in emphasising on measurement. The scientist and statistician Galton (as cited in Barenbaum & Winter, 2008, p.3) proclaimed that ''The character which shapes our conduct is a definite and durable 'something,' and therefore ... it is reasonable to attempt to measure it" (Galton, 1884, p.179). Furthermore, Thomdike (1914) argued that "if a thing exists, it exists in some *amount*; and if it exists in some amount, it can *be*

1

measured'' (p.141, as cited in Barenbaum & Winter, 2008, p.3). Since then, the concern for personality assessment has progressed and a number of personality tests have been formalised to measure traits of personality. The notion of *trait* has been applied as a reference to the correlated expressive and stylistic types of behaviour (Winter et al., 1998, pp. 232-233). Today, personality assessment tools that have been developed involve "ratings" and "behaviour observations" (Barenbaum & Winter, 2008, p.3).

According to Jung's theory, which will be discussed in detail later, each individual has a *natural preference*, that when used preferably, usually "succeeds better and feel[s] more competent, natural and dynamic" (Behaz & Djoudi, 2012, p.136). Jung's Psychological Types theory proposed six types in which individuals differ and categorised them into three groups: attitudes (extraversion and introversion), perceptual functions (intuition and sensing), and judgmental functions (thinking and feeling). Extraversion/introversion attitudes label individuals' mind-sets in dealing with others. An extravert is outgoing, concerned about people and environment, whereas, introverted interests are internally focused. Regarding perceiving preferences, an intuitive person is likely to perceive stimuli comprehensively, concentrating on meaning rather than details, while a sensing individual observes information realistically and accurately. The Judgment or understanding of perceived stimuli is embodied in two ways; thinking individuals are likely to be impersonal, logical and analytical, whereas feeling people are grounded more on values than logic (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1997).

Introversion and extraversion are the most common and widely used types. Introverts focus on their own inner world, whereas extraverts prefer to focus on the outer world.

An extravert, for Richards and Schmidt (2002), is "a person whose conscious interests and energies are more often directed outwards [to] other people and events than towards the person themselves and their own inner experience", while an introvert is seen as "a person who tends to avoid social contact with others and is often preoccupied with his or her inner feelings, thoughts and experiences" (p.213). Contrary to what is common, introversion is not associated with psychological problems, anti-social personality disorder, or social phobia (Helgoe, 2013; Pennington, 2012). Neither does this mean that someone is insane or a criminal (Cain, 2012b).

However, introverts are mostly sensitive (Aron & Aron, 1997). In fact, 70% of highly sensitive people tend to be introverts (Aron, 1997) and they are less expected to be narcissistic (Dembling, 2012). Most introverts are passionate about their values, empathetic and even good leaders and they are more likely to maintain healthy lifestyles (Pennington, 2012). Jung once wrote: "They [introverts] are living evidence that this rich and varied world with its overflowing and intoxicating life is not purely external, but also exists within" (as cited in Aron & Aron, 1997, p.100). In most cases, people confuse shyness with introversion; shyness is more a fear of social judgment while introversion, as noted previously, puts emphasis on the "me time" to recharge. Introverts become immersed in their inner world and run the risk of losing touch with their surroundings or with their outer world. They also tend to be introspective and keep their social circle limited (Cain, 2012a). In the same token, Henjum (1982) described two

distinct types of introverts: Type A introverts are able to collaborate and work well with others, and are self-actualised but reserved. Type B introverts are more timid and shyer and they tend to avoid confronting society.

Extraversion, on the other hand, is the most widely researched construct in personality psychology. Extraversion is associated with social engagement, positive emotion, and life satisfaction (Ashton, Lee, & Paunonen, 2002; John & Srivastava, 1999). An extravert prefers getting energy from lively involvement in events and engaging in different activities, moving from one action to another. Extraverts like to be around people and to energise other people. In general, an extravert is seen as "outgoing" or as a "people person" who feels comfortable in groups and like working in them, he or she is sociable and is someone who acts before thinking (Martin, 1997).

Introversion and extraversion attract people's attention in all fields but they "start to lose their dynamic roots" as we start to "see ourselves as introverted OR extraverted, rather than as a creative, evolving combination of the two" (Helgoe, 2013, p.19).

According to Myers-Briggs and Myers (1993), introverts and extraverts complete each other, yet they are quite different. Cain (2012b) claimed that "the most effective teams are composed of a healthy mix of introverts and extraverts" (p.93). An introvert is more subjective, reserved, questioning, and someone who lives when he/she understands. An extravert, on the other hand, is more objective, relaxed, comfortable, and someone who lives to understand. In general, introverts seek to understand the meaning while extraverts seek sensory stimulation (Pennington, 2012). Introverts are seen to be more reflective (Kolb, 1984), while extraverts are more active (Silver, Strong, & Perini, 2000).

Jung (1971) declared that in order to adapt, a person has the ability to change from one situation to another and he or she generally grows more introverted as he/she ages. However, Kolb (1984) referred to the stability of the personality type when he stated that "several longitudinal studies have shown introversion/extraversion to be one of the most stable characteristics of personality from childhood to old age" (p.76). According to Little's "Free Trait Theory" of Personality (2014a), individuals can adopt different personality characteristics for short periods of time. However, it is not only an exhausting and energetic process, but people will also have a difficult time acquiring traits that are different from their own. Little (2014b) illustrated the obvious contradictions in the extraversion/introversion debate by giving the example of how Barack Obama, although an introvert, can yet amaze large audiences with his speeches. This is due to the self-monitoring trait which is a separate trait that helps individuals to change their persona to fit the demands of a certain situation, even if it involves going against natural tendencies. Most importantly, self-monitoring can be smoother if someone is acting in accordance with deep beliefs.

Personality psychology has been applied to different fields such as the economy, computer sciences and engineering, yet personality is mostly addressed in education and all aspects of learning, including literacy. Concerning language learning and since

personality types are "those aspects of an individual's behaviour, attitudes, beliefs, thoughts, actions, and feelings which are seen as typical and distinctive of that person and recognized as such by that person and others" (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p.395), Ehrman & Oxford (1989) believed that each of those aspects and preferences that compose a psychological type has its own properties and commitments when it comes to language learning. Thus, theoreticians in personality research field attempted to analyse linguistic behaviour at a universal level; however, they did not explain linguistic subsystems in detail. Psycholinguists and sociolinguists were also puzzled by the diversity of theories in the field of personality research (Dewaele & Furnham., 1999).

Literacy, according to Williams (2004), can be categorised as "narrow" and "broad" literacy. The narrowed traditional definition is identified by the standard dictionary as "the ability to read and write." The focal point of this definition is individual abilities. Thus, many theories of reading and writing observed "reading as comprehension, and writing as composition, in both first and additional languages". A broad perception of literacy emerged as a part of an intellectual movement in the 1980s that shifted the emphasis from individualism, which was proposed by the earlier psychological approaches, towards socialism. Overall, the broad viewpoint of literacy focuses on the values and senses of "literate behaviour in social contexts". Even though it advocates a critical outlook, literacy is suitable for the communicative competence concept (p.23).

In 1978, Niaman and many other researchers covered the "Good Language Learner" (GLL) concept to display the characteristics that contribute to the effectiveness of language learning. Therefore, integrating reading into language learning sounds reasonable if the 'Good and Poor Readers' are considered, and it answers the question "why some readers outperform others as good readers?" (As cited in Sadeghi et al., 2012, p.120).

As a rule, readers who achieve good grades in reading tasks are possibly improving their reading abilities, whereas readers who score poor grades in reading tasks are more likely to promote negative reading competency beliefs (Medford & McGeown, 2012). Overall, since the personality types of individuals have a great influence on their lifestyles, attitudes and preferences, it is logical to observe the salient impact of personality traits on their academic performance.

1.3   Theoretical Framework of the Study

This research is grounded on three main theories: Carl Jung's (1923) psychological types theory or model of typology; Hans Eysenck's (1967) approach to biological basis of personality; and Rumelhart's (1977) interactive model of reading comprehension.

Among the several models of personality types, Jung's theory of psychological types is the most well-known. The Swiss psychiatrist and psychotherapist Carl G Jung was the first to describe personality attitudes in 1921. The basic assumption of Jung's theory is that each person is special in his/her way of understanding the surrounding world and

deriving energy that creates uniqueness. In 1942, Katharine Cook Briggs and her daughter Isabel Briggs Myers developed the Myers and Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) which applied Jung's theory of personality types. The MBTI is a self-report questionnaire that makes it easy for people to understand their potential qualities. MBTI assesses personality in four separate scales: Extraversion versus Introversion, Sensing versus Intuition, Thinking versus Feeling, and Judging versus Perceiving (Rushton et al., 2007). The MBTI four-letter formula (type dynamics) offers a short description of the correlation of the four processes. The first and the last letters (E/I, J/P) represent the attitudes and orientations that involve interaction with the world. The two middle letters (NT, NF, ST, and SF) are called function pairs as they represent the mental functions based on the brain's work ("The Myers & Briggs Foundation", 2016). Jung's approach to personality was considered to be significant in the initial development of personality psychology. However, most of the related research of Jung emphasises on his explanations of personality types. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers, 1962) is the most commonly used measure of Jung's personality types and is frequently used by school counsellors to point students toward fulfilling opportunities of their studies. In recent times, researchers have extended work on the practicality of Jungian personality types by considering the role of types in the way people cope with their personal investments and the type of careers they embark on (Feist & Feist, 2009).

Eysenck further gave more biological-based explanations to the introversion/extraversion dimension. His arousal theory offers a physiological clarification of extraversion regarding the cortical arousal through the ascending reticular activating system (ARAS). Activating the ARAS irritates the cerebral cortex to provide higher cortical arousal. Due to the dissimilar levels of ARAS activity, "introverts are characterized by higher levels of activity than extraverts and so are chronically more cortically aroused than extraverts" (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985, p.197). As a result, introverts and extraverts behave differently and thus, learn differently.

Regarding reading comprehension, Rumelhart's (1977) interactive model proposes that a pattern is created based on information delivered simultaneously from several sources. This model insists that reading includes the use of both higher mental operation and the lower text processing. In other terms, both bottom-up and top-down approaches are essential fundamentals for completing the reading tasks.

1.4 Statement of the Problem

Understanding personality is crucial as it determines the rationale behind contradictions in terms of identity and consideration of differences in performances and practice (Roth, 2012).

As noted previously, Jung's theory of psychological types (1971) does not only refer to the two mutually exclusive attitudes – extraversion and introversion where every human is energised either by the external world as an extravert or the internal world as an introvert – it also describes the personality functions demonstrated in thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition. Eventually, Introversion/extraversion types were eventually

categorised into eight groups: (a) introverted sensors, (b) introverted intuition, (c) introverted thinkers, (d) introverted feelers, (e) extraverted sensors, (f) extraverted intuition, (g) extraverted thinkers, and (h) extraverted feelers.

Later, Myers added perceiving/judging dichotomies that have been linked to introversion/extraversion dichotomies (Spoto, 1995). An individual goes through the process of judging and perceiving when dealing with the outer world (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

In the learning domain, each personality type learns in a different way. In fact, studies have suggested that introverts should be more advanced in tasks that demand the consciousness of knowledge rather than in calculative problem-solving activities, whether the demand is direct or indirect. This hypothesis has been supported by many researchers such as Robinson (1985, 1986) and Himmelweit (1945, 1946) (as cited in Robinson et al., 1994). Barrett and Eysenck (1992) further claimed that introverts achieve somewhat higher scores on the verbal compared to performance subtests of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) while the opposite situation is true for extraverts.

From a second language learning viewpoint, the same argument proposes that extraverts should better accomplish spontaneous oral performance tests while introverts should perform well in written tests as those tests assess the knowledge of language that is attainable through conscious processes (Robinson et al., 1994). This hypothesis is also supported by Busch (1982) who reported that extraverted males have greater oral scores and introverts tend to have better scores in reading and grammar tasks. Busch's research also indicated that extraverts may be less adept than introverts at written performance. Lau and Cheung (1988) further claimed that since reading is a solitary activity, it mostly attracts introverts more than extraverts.

Even functional types (thinking, feeling, sensing and intuition) differ in the manner of learning. Myers and Myers (1980) claimed that introverted intuitive types have higher academic giftedness. Sak (2004) also confirmed that most gifted adolescents are perceptive types. Further, intuitive learners are more likely to apply abstract principles of language and feel comfortable predicting and guessing, whereas sensing students are possibly less creative. Thinkers are more gifted in analysing language data and dealing with details than feelers who are less likely to use guessing and compensation strategies such as rephrasing (Sharp, 2002; Sharp 2004).

In fact, different studies (for example, Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978; Busch, 1982; Robinson, 1985, 1986; Ehrman, 2008; Wakamoto, 2009). Sadeghi et al., 2012 (among many others) have investigated the relationship between personality types and language learning. Yet, existing literature offers contradictory findings about which personality type performed better in the different language tasks.

Moreover, some of those studies that attempted to explain the relationship between personality and language learning portrayed extraversion as the master type in language learning, and neglected introversion. Even when examining introversion, most of the former research gave little concern to observing and elaborating the different types offered in the MBTI; more specifically, to function pairs.

With regard to literacy, only a limited number of studies, such as DiTiberio and Jensen (2007); Ellis (2004) and Sak (2004), examined the correlation between literacy (in terms of reading and writing) and personality. In fact, psychologists have only recently started to pay attention to reading as an aspect of personality (Dollinger, 2015). All the above reasons offer a foundation for the present study.

There is currently insufficient literature on the correlation between introversion/extraversion and reading, especially with regard to studies on L1 Arabic learners. In fact, most of studies that examined reading ability in English with L1 Arabic learners of L2 English have focused on external factors. For instance, Al-Nafisah, (2011) investigated learners' reading strategies, while Bataineh and Al-Barakat (2005) examined reading interests of and material sources available to Arab learners. Literature on internal aspects such as personality have so far, not been conclusive. Therefore, this study tries to draw conclusions about the relationship between introversion/extraversion and the L2 reading proficiency of Arab undergraduates. The key issue to be considered in this study is to investigate which function pair that represents the mental functions (NT, NF, SF or ST) of introversion/extraversion achieves the highest reading proficiency score.

1.5 Aim and Objectives of Study

This study will attempt to investigate the relationship between introversion/extraversion and the L2 reading proficiency of L1 Arabic learners, and then compare the different introversion/extraversion types that gained the highest scores in a reading test.

This study will specifically examine the effect of personality types, (introversion and extraversion) on reading proficiency levels of undergraduate students and correlate their introversion/extraversion types to L2 reading proficiency. Based on the statement of the problem, the following objectives are formulated for the study:

1. To analyse personality traits of L1 Arab undergraduates;
2. To examine students' reading proficiency levels in English (L2) and associate their reading proficiency with introversion and extraversion; and
3. To determine the function pairs of introverts and extraverts that contribute to the highest result of L2 reading proficiency.

1.6   Research Questions

The study will address the following research questions which are formulated based on the objectives above:

1. Which is the most dominant personality type among Arab undergraduates?
2. Compared to extraversion, what is the relationship between students' introversion and their L2 reading proficiency?
3. What are the function pairs of introverted and extraverted types that represent the highest scores of L2 reading proficiency?

1.7   Significance of the Study

The issue that most schools today face is that the schools are designed for left-brained extraverts (Laney, 2005). As Galagan (2012) further added, "A disproportionately high number of very creative people are introverts ... but schools and workplaces make it difficult for people to find time and space" (p.28). For example, the group work enforcement at schools might be physically and mentally painful for introverts (Pennington, 2012). Cain (2012a) referred to some successful introverted writers, artists, thinkers and leaders like Eleanor Roosevelt, Warren Buffet, Gandhi, Rosa Parks, Bill Gates, Barbra Streisand, T.S. Eliot, Al Gore, and many others. Cain (2012b) further added that "some of our greatest ideas, art, and inventions from the theory of evolution to Van Gogh's sunflowers to the personal computer — came from quiet and cerebral people" (p.5). Therefore, "why would we not want more people like this?" and "why would we want to stifle individuals like this?" (Lawrence, 2014, p.23).

Brown (1973) called for the need to search for interdisciplinary solutions to solve language learning problems and suggested the key role of psychology awareness. Brown also emphasised the necessity of examining human personality as an instrument that provides answers to language learning problems in a class full of different personalities.

In schools, some 'quiet' students may be unprepared for class, or disengaged, but some of them may also be introverted personality holders who choose to observe and then reflect, or to think and speak later. In other words, introverted students need time to set and connect opinions, which refers back to valid biological reasons (Laney, 2002). As a consequence, group work (collaborative learning) is less likely to suit introverts as they enjoy individual work, but will more likely fit extraverts who enjoy cooperative work (Sternberg, 1999). In particular, Myers and McCaulley (1985) claimed that intuitive-introverts favour self-paced learning such as project-based learning where they can create and broaden their own work (Sternberg 1999; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2000).

In contrast, extraverted students tend to appreciate working on group projects, presentations, debates and welcome opportunities to have the spotlight centred on them in the classroom (Wilson, 2013). Extraverts learn better through direct experiences and their ideas come from outside sources. Extraverts add energy and verbal enthusiasm to a classroom. They can inspire and encourage their classmates and when their energy is

properly directed, they are able to be excellent group leaders as they are not afraid to speak their minds. However, most extraverted students struggle when it comes to quieter, lonesome tasks like reading, research and writing (Levy, 2014).

Building on Sak's (2004) proposition of the usefulness of the variety of teaching methods instead of relying on a single method where the chance of excluding certain students is higher, the adjustment of teaching-learning strategies based on personality types may lead to learning improvement. This study aims to investigate the influence of personality types on language learning and, in particular, on reading proficiency. This will help language instructors to better understand the needs of their learners according to their own character traits rather than imposing a limited style that is not adequate or forcing them to act out of character.

Most notably, teachers should not attempt to force their introverted students to turn into extraverts. An introvert's independence, quiet thinking and the contentment of being comfortable with himself or herself should be praised and cultivated.

Teachers are advised to remember that a well-balanced classroom is desired. This can only be achieved by giving suitable opportunities to all personalities which will lead to an effective and supportive classroom environment.

1.8   Chapter Summary

In conclusion, this chapter displayed the research background of the study followed by an overview of personality types and language learning, supported by the main theories in the field. Next, the problem statement was highlighted, supported by the objectives and research questions. Finally, the significance of the study was discussed.

1.9   Thesis Plan

This thesis has five chapters. The first chapter serves as the introduction to the research concept, theories under consideration and other issues pertinent to the study. The second chapter is devoted to covering a review of existing literature on personality psychology interrelated with language learning and reading, covering the main theories and introducing the research framework and hypotheses. The next chapter (Chapter Three) presents the research methodology and data analysis procedures. Chapter Four will cover the results, interpretation and discussion. The last chapter (Chapter Five) offers conclusions, including implications and future research suggestions.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A., Kumar, V., & Day, G. S. (2004). *Marketing research.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Abadzi, H. (2003). *Improving Adult Literacy Outcomes: Lessons from Cognitive Research for Developing Countries*. Washington DC: World Bank. (Directions in Development Series).

Abadzi, H. (2004) *Strategies and Policies for Literacy Background*. Paper for the Education For All Global Monitoring Report 2005. http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/file_download.php/5f222d91a143f86554 88cea41e3ace6bAba dzi,+H.+Strategies+and+policies+for+literacy.doc.Stricker, L. J. & J. Ross. (1962). *A Description and Evaluation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (Research Bulletin #RB-62-6). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Ackerman, P. L., & Heggestad, E. D. (1997). Intelligence, personality, and interests: evidence for overlapping traits. *Psychological bulletin*, *121*(2), 219.

Alderson, J. C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading problem or a language problem? In J. C. Alderson & A. H. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language* (pp. 1-24). London: Longman.

Allik, J., & Realo, A. (1997). Intelligence, academic abilities, and personality.*Personality and individual differences*, *23*(5), 809-814.

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt.

Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Al-Nafisah, K. (2011). Saudi EFL students' reading interests. *Journal of King Saud University-Languages and Translation,* 23(1), 1-9.

Al-Shorman, R.A., Bataineh, R.F., 2004. Jordanian EFL university students' reading interests. *Abhath Al-Yarmouk (The Journal of Yarmouk University/Humanities and Social Sciences Series)* 21 (3a), 35–56.

Anastasiou, D., & Griva, E. (2009). Awareness of reading strategy use and reading comprehension among poor and good readers. *İlköğretim Online*, 8(2).

Aron, E. N., & Aron, A. (1997). Sensory-processing sensitivity and its relation to introversion and emotionality. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 73(2), 345.

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Paunonen, S. V. (2002). What is the central feature of extraversion? Social attention versus reward sensitivity. *Journal of personality and social psychology,* 83(1), 245.

Ayoubi, R., & Ustwani, B. (2014). The relationship between student's MBTI®, preferences and academic performance at a Syrian university. *Education+ Training*, *56*(1), 78-90.Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal university samples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(4), 319-338.

Baddeley, A. D. (2000). Short-term and working memory. *The Oxford handbook of memory*, 77-92.

Barenbaum, N. B., & Winter, D. G. (2008). History of modern personality theory and research. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 3–27). New York: Guilford Press.

Bargh, J. A. (1982). Attention and automaticity in the processing of self-relevant information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 43,* 425-436.

Barrett, P. T., & Eysenck, H. J. (1992). Brain evoked potentials and intelligence: *The Hendrickson paradigm. Intelligence*, 16(3), 361-381.

Bataineh, R.F., Al-Barakat, A.A., 2005. The reading interests of Jordanian first-, second-, and third-grade pupils' and the obstacles limiting these interests. *Journal of Education and Psychological Sciences (The Journal of the University of Bahrain)* 6 (3), 107–133.

Baumann, J. F. (1984). The effectiveness of a direct instruction paradigm for teaching main idea comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 93-115.

Behaz, A., & Djoudi, M. (2012). Adaptation of learning resources based on the MBTI theory of psychological types. *International Journal of Computer Science Issues*, *9*(1), 135-141.

Bell, J. S. (1995). The relationship between L1 and L2 literacy: Some complicating factors. *TESOL quarterly*, *29*(4), 687-704.

Belojevic, G., Slepcevic, V., & Jakovljevic, B. (2001). Mental performance in noise: the role of introversion. *Journal of environmental Psychology*, *21*(2), 209-213.

Berenbaum, H., & Williams, M. (1994). Extraversion, hemispatial bias, and eye blink rates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *17*(6), 849-852.

Berens, L. V. (1999). *Dynamics of personality type: Understanding and applying Jung's cognitive processes*. Huntington Beach, CA: Telos Publications.

Berman, R. A. (1984) Syntactic components of the foreign language reading process. In J. C. Alderson & A. H. Urquhart (eds.), *Reading in a Foreign Language*, (pp. 139–59).

Bjork, R. A., & Druckman, D. (1991). *In the mind's eye: Enhancing human performance*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Blickle, G. (1996). Personality traits, learning strategies, and performance. *European Journal of Personality*, *10*(5), 337-352.

Block, E., (1992). See how they read: comprehension monitoring of L1 and L2 readers. *TESOL Quarterly* 26, 319–343.

Block, J. (1971). *Lives through time*. Berkley, CA: Bancroft Books.

Block, J., & Ozer, D. J. (1982). Two types of psychologists: Remarks on the Mendelsohn, Weiss, and Feimer contribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 1171–1181.

Bodling, A. M., & Martin, T. (2011). Eysenck Personality Inventory. In *Encyclopedia of Clinical Neuropsychology* (pp. 1007-1008). New York: Springer.

Boekaerts, M. (1996). Personality and the psychology of learning. European. *Journal of Personality,* 10, 377-404.

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. *Educational researcher*, *34*(6), 3-15.

Boslaugh, S. (2004). *An Intermediate Guide to SPSS Programming: Using Syntax for Data Management: Using Syntax for Data Management*. New York: Sage Publications.

Boslaugh, S. (2004*). An Intermediate Guide to SPSS Programming: Using Syntax for Data Management: Using Syntax for Data Management*. London: Sage Publications.

Breen, M. (2001) overt participation and covert acquisition in the language classroom. In M. Breen (ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning* (pp. 112–40). London: Longman.

Briggs-Myers, I., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (2003). MBTI manual. *A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. 3rd Edition.* Menlo Park, CA: CPP Inc.

Brown, H. D. (1973). Affective variables in second language acquisition. *Language learning*, *23*(2), 231-244.

Burckhardt, J. (1954). *The civilization of the Renaissance in Italy.* New York: Modern Library. (Original work published 1860).

Burruss, J. D., & Kaenzig, L. (1999). Introversion: The often forgotten factor impacting the gifted. *Virginia Association for the Gifted Newsletter*, *21*(1), 1-4.

Busato, V. V., Prins, F. J., & Elshout, J. J. C. Hamaker (1999). The relation between learning styles, the Big Five personality traits and achievement motivation in higher education. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *26*(1), 129-140.

Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extroversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students. *Language Learning*, *46*(1), 109-132.

Cain, S. (2012a, March 4). *The power of introverts* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c0KYU2j0TM4.

Cain, S. 2012b. *Quiet: The power of introverts in a world that can't stop talking*. New York: Crown Publishing Group.

Cantor, N., & Zirkl, S. (1990). Personality, cognition, and purposive behaviour. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 135-164). USA: Guilford Press.

Capraro, R. M., & Capraro, M. M. (2002). Myers-Briggs type indicator score reliability across: Studies a meta-analytic reliability generalization study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *62*(4), 590-602.

Carducci, B. J. (2009). *The psychology of personality: Viewpoints, research, and applications*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Carrel, P. L., & Monroe, L. B. (1993). Learning styles and composition. *Modern Language Journal,* 77(2), 148-162.

Carrel, P. L., Prince, M. S., & Astica, G. G. (1996). Personality type and language learning in an EFL context. *Language Learning Journal*, 46, 75-99.

Carrell, P. L. (1991). Second language reading: Reading ability or language proficiency? *Applied Linguistics*, 12, 159–179.

Carrell, P. L., & Eisterhold, J. C. (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL quarterly*, *17*(4), 553-573.

Carrell, P., Pharis, B., Liberto, J., (1989). Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly* 23, 647–678.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2012). *Perspectives on personality*. Boston: Pearson.

Chalhoub-Deville, M., & Turner, C. E. (2000). What To Look for in ESL Admission Tests: Cambridge Certificate Exams, IELTS, and TOEFL. System: *An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics,* 28(4), 523-39.

Chamorro―Premuzic, T., & Fumham, A. (2003). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal university samples. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*(4), 319. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00578-0

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal university samples. *Journal of Research in Personality,* 37(4), 319-338.

Clark, R. E., & Estes, F. (2002). *Turning research into results*. Atlanta, GA: CEP Press.

Clarke, M., Silberstein, S., (1977). Toward a realization of psycholinguistic principles for the ESL reading class. *Language Learning* 27, 134–154.

Coady, J., (1979). A psycholinguistic model of the ESL reader. In: Mackay, R., Barkman, B., Jordan, R. (Eds.), *Reading in a Second Language*. Newbury House, Rowley, MA, pp. 5–12.

Cox-Fuenzalida, L. E., Angie, A., Holloway, S., & Sohl, L. (2006). Extraversion and task performance: A fresh look through the workload history lens. *Journal of research in personality,* 40(4), 432-439.

Cramer, D., & Howitt, D. L. (2004). *The Sage dictionary of statistics: a practical resource for students in the social sciences.* New York: Sage Publication.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA. USA: Sage Publication.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. New York: Sage publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.

Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority language children.* Toronto: OISE Press.

Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education*. New York: Longman.

Daniels. M. (2016). *Jungian Psychological Types.* Watchwordtest.com. Retrieved 27 July 2016, from http://www.watchwordtest.com/types.aspx.

De Landsheere, G. (1988). *History of educational research*. In J. P. Keeves (Ed.), Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook (pp. 9–16). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

De Raad, B., & Schuwenburg, H. C. (1996). Personality in learning and education: A Review. *European Journal of personality*, 10, 303-306.

De Vaus, D. A., & de Vaus, D. (2001). *Research design in social research*. New York: Sage Publication.

Dembling, S. (2012). *The Introvert's Way: Living a Quiet Life in a Noisy World*. London: Penguin.

Devine, J., (1993). The role of metacognition in second language reading and writing. In: Carson, J., Leki, I. (Eds.), *Reading in the Composition Classroom: Second Language Perspectives*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.Entwistle, N. J., Hanley, M., & Ratcliffe, G. (1979). *Approaches to learning and levels of understanding. British Educational Research Journal*, 5(1), 99-114.

Dewaele, J. M., & Furnham, A. (1999). Extraversion: The unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning*, *49*(3), 509-544.

Diamond, D.M., Campbell, A.M., Park, C.R., Halonen, J., Zoladz, P.R (2007) The temporal dynamics model of emotional memory processing: A synthesis on the neurobiological basis of stress-induced amnesia, flashbulb and traumatic memories, and the Yerkes-Dodson Law. *Neural Plast*. 2007:60803

Diseth, Å. (2003). Personality and approaches to learning as predictors of academic achievement. *European Journal of personality*, 17(2), 143-155.

DiTiberio, J. K., & Jensen, G. H. (2007). *Writing and personality: Finding your voice, your style, your way*. New York: Karnac Books.

Doane, D. P., & Seward, L. E. (2011). Measuring skewness: a forgotten statistic. *Journal of Statistics Education*, 19(2), 1-18.

Dollinger, S. J. (2015). "You Are as You Read": Do Students' Reading Interests Contribute to Their Individuality? *Reading Psychology*, 1-26.

Dollinger, S. J., & Orf, L. A. (1991). Personality and performance in "personality": Conscientiousness and openness. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *25*(3), 276-284.

Educational Testing Service (2000). *POWERPREP: Preparation for the computer-based TOEFL test* (CD-ROM). New York: Princeton.

Educational Testing Service. (2002). *TOEFL® Test preparation kit workbook.* New York: Princeton.

Ehrman, M. (2001). Bringing learning strategies to the student: The FSI language learning consultation service. Alatis, J. E., Tan, A. (Eds.), *Language in Our Time: Bilingual Education and Official English, Ebonics and Standard English, Immigration and the Unz Initiative*. (pp. 41–58), Washington DC: Georgetown University press.

Ehrman, M. (2008). *4 Personality and good language learners. Lessons from good language learners*, (pp. 61-72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ehrman, M. E. (1996). *Understanding second language learning difficulties*. New York: Sage Publications.

Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *Modern Language Journal*, 67-89.

Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *System*, *31*(3), 313-330.

80

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal*, *73*(1), 1-13.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The modern language journal*, 74(3), 311-327.

Elliott, A. C., & Woodward, W. A. (2007). *Statistical analysis quick reference guidebook: With SPSS examples*. New York: Sage Publication.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2004) 'Individual differences in second language learning'. In A. Davies and C. Elder (Eds.). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, (pp. 525-551).

Erton, I. (2010). Relations between personality traits, language learning styles and success in foreign language achievement. *Journal of Education*, *38*, 115-126.

Eskey, D. (1988). Holding in the bottom: An interactive approach to the language problems of second language readers. *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. 93-100.

ETS. (2002). *TOEIC Bridge Examinee Handbook*. New York: The Chauncey Group International.

ETS. (2007). *TOEIC® Bridge Examinee Handbook*. Retrieved from http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/TOEIC_Bridge/pdf/TOEIC_BridgeExam.pdf

ETS. (2010). *TOEIC Bridge® Data & Analysis* 2009. Retrieved from http://www.toeic.or.jp/bridge/pdf/data/Bridge2009_DAA.pdf

ETS. (2011). *Examinee Handbook TOEIC Bridge test*. New York: Princeton.

Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The biological basis of personality*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Eysenck, H. J. (1985). Personality, cancer and cardiovascular disease: a causal analysis. *Personality and individual differences*, *6*(5), 535-556.

Eysenck, H. J. (1990). Biological dimensions of personality. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 244-276). New York: Guilford.

Eysenck, H. J. (1990). *Biological dimensions of personality*. New York: Guilford Press.

Eysenck, H. J., & Cookson, D. (1969). Personality in primary school children. British *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 39(2), 123-130.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1964). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Eysenck, M. W. (1981). *Learning, memory and personality. In A model for personality* (pp. 169-209). Berlin: Springer.

Eysenck, S. B., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and individual differences*, *6*(1), 21-29.

Faitz L.M. (2016). *In Defense of Introversion. Mckendree.edu*. Retrieved from http://www.mckendree.edu/academics/scholars/issue18/faitz.htm

Farley, F. H., & Truog, A. L. (1970). Individual differences in reading comprehension. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *3*(1), 29-35.

Farr, R., Pritchard, R., & Smitten, B. (1990). A description of what happens when an examinee takes a multiple-choice reading comprehension test. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, *27*(3), 209-226.

Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2009). Theories of Personality (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. Gareis, E. (2012). Intercultural friendship: Effects of home and host region. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 5(4), 309-328.

File:MyersBriggsTypes.png - Wikimedia Commons. (2014). Commons.wikimedia.org. Retrieved   from https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:MyersBriggsTypes.png

Florida and the Islands Comprehensive Center, Learning Styles/Personality Types (2008). Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/flicc/archives.html#fourth.

Fries, C. C. (1963). *Linguistics and reading* (Vol. 2). Teaching Faster Reading. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Furnham, A., & Bradley, A. (1997). Music while you work: The differential distraction of background music on the cognitive test performance of introverts and extraverts. *Applied cognitive psychology*, *11*(5), 445-455.

Furnham, A., & Petrides, K. V. (2014). Eysenck's Personality Theory. In*Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 1538-1545). New York. USA: Springer.

Galagan, P. (2012). *Quiet time: should extroverts learns to sit down and shut up*? T & D. American Society for Training & Development. Massachusetts: Gardner.

Galton, F. (1884). Measurement of character. *Fortnightly Review,* 36, 179-185.

Gardner, H. E. (2000). *Intelligence Reframed: Multiple Int*. New York: Perseus Books Group.

Garner, R., 1987. *Metacognition and Reading Comprehension*. New York: Ablex Publishing.

Geen, R. G. (1984). Preferred stimulation levels in introverts and extraverts: Effects on arousal and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 1303-1312.

Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P, & Zedeck, S. (1981). *Measurement theory for the behavioral sciences.* New York: Freeman & company.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (2002). *Teaching and research reading*. Harlow: Longman.

Green, A., Peters, T. J., & Webster, D. J. T. (1991). An assessment of academic performance and personality. *Medical Education*, *25*(4), 343-348.

Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review,* 102, 4-27

Griffiths, C. (2008). *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heaton, J. (2004). *Reworking qualitative data*. New York: Sage Publication

Heaton, J. B. (1990). *Classroom testing*. New York: Pearson.

Helgoe, L. (2013). *Introvert power: Why your inner life is your hidden strength*. New York: Sourcebooks, Inc.

Henjum, A. (1982). Introversion: A misunderstood" individual difference" among students. *Education*, 103(1).

Himmelweit, H. T. (1945). The intelligence-vocabulary ratio as a measure of temperament. *Journal of Personality*, 14(2), 93-105.

Himmelweit, H. T. (1946). Speed and accuracy of work as related to temperament. *British Journal of Psychology. General Section*, 36(3), 132-144.

Hogan, R. (2005). In defense of personality measurement: New wine for old whiners. *Human Performance*, 18(4), 331-341.

Hoover, W. A., & Tunmer, W. E. (1993). 1 The Components of Reading. *Reading acquisition processes*, *4*, 1.

Hornberger, N. H. (1989) Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59, 271–296.

Howarth, E., & Eysenck, H. J. (1968). Extraversion, arousal, and paired-associate recall. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*. Vol 3(2), 114-116.

Howes, R. J., & Carskadon, T. G. (1979). Test-retest reliabilities of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator as a function of mood changes. *Research in Psychological Type*, 2(1), 67-72.

Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ibrahimoglu, N., Unaldi, I., Samancioglu, M., & Baglibel, M. (2013). The relationship between personality traits and learning styles: a cluster analysis. *Asian Journal OF Management Sciences And Education*, 93-108.

Jensen, G. H., & DiTiberio, J. K. (1984). Personality and individual writing processes. *College Composition and Communication*, 285-300.

Jiménez, R. T., García, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1996). The reading strategies of bilingual Latina/o students who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *31*(1), 90-112.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, *2*(1999), 102-138.

Jung, C. G. (1971). Psychological types, volume 6 of the collected works of CG Jung. R.F.C. Hull (Ed) *Princeton University Press*, 18, 169-170.

Jung, C. G. (2015). *Collected Works of CG Jung: The First Complete English Edition of the Works of CG Jung*. G.Adler, M.Fordham & H. Read (Eds). New York: Routledge.

Jupp, V. (Ed.). (2006). *The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications, Ltd. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9780857020116.

Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1987). *The psychology of reading and language comprehension*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Kantor, J. R., Jung, C. G., & Baynes, H. G. (1923). Psychological Types. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 20(23), 636. doi:10.2307/2014910

Kern, R., 1989. Second language reading strategy instruction: its effects on comprehension and word inference ability. *Modern Language Journal* 73, 135–146.

Kihlstrom, J. F. (1990). The psychological unconscious. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 445-464). New York: Guilford Press.

Kim, J., Lee, A., & Ryu, H. (2013). Personality and its effects on learning performance: Design guidelines for an adaptive e-learning system based on a user model. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, *43*(5), 450-461.

Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: A construction-integration model. *Psychological Review*, 95, 163-182.

Kleinsmith, L. J., & Kaplan, S. (1963). Paired-associate learning as a function of arousal and interpolated interval. *Journal of experimental psychology*, *65*(2), 190.

Kletzien, S., 1991. Strategy use by good and poor comprehenders reading expository text of differing levels. *Reading Research Quarterly* 25, 67–86.

Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.

Kolb, B. (1984). Functions of the frontal cortex of the rat: a comparative review. *Brain Research Reviews,* 8(1), 65-98.

Krebs Hirsh, S., & Kummerow, J. (1989). *Life Types. Understand Yourself and Make the Most of Who You Are*. New York: Warner Books Inc.

Kremelberg, D. (2011). Linear regression. In Practical statistics: *A quick and easy guide to IBM® SPSS® statistics, STATA, and other statistical software.* (pp. 205-235). New York: Sage Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483385655.n5

Laney, M. O. (2002). *The introvert advantage: How to thrive in an extrovert world*. New York: Workman Publishing.

Laney, M. O. (2005). *The hidden gifts of the introverted child: Helping your child thrive in an extroverted world*. New York: Workman Publishing.

Lau, S., & Cheung, S. M. (1988). Reading interests of Chinese adolescents: Effects of personal and social factors. *International Journal of Psychology*, 23(1-6), 695-705.

Lawrence, G., & Martin, C. R. (2001). *Building people, building programs: A practitioner's guide for introducing the MBTI to individuals and organizations*. Center for Applications of Psychological Type.

Lawrence, W. K. (2014). The experience of contrasting learning styles, learning preferences, and personality types in the community college English classroom. *Education Doctoral Theses. Paper 159.* Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d20004841.

Leaver, B. L. (1998). *Teaching the Whole Class* (fifth ed). New York. USA: Kendall Hunt.

Levy, L. (2014). *How to Help Extroverts Thrive in the Classroom*. Retrieved from http://www.edudemic.com/help-extroverts-thrive-classroom/

Lewis, P., Thornhill, A., & Saunders, M. (2007). *Research methods for business students.* New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Lieberman, M. D. (2000). Introversion and working memory: Central executive differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(3), 479-486.

Little, B. **(**2014a, Jun 13**).** *Confessions of a passionate introvert* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NZ5o9PcHeL0

Little, B. R. (2014b). *Me, Myself, and Us: The Science of Personality and the Art of Well-being*. New York: PublicAffairs.

MacIntyre, P. D., Clement, R., & Noels, K. A. (2007). Affective variables, attitude and personality in context. *Handbook of French applied linguistics*, 270-298.

MacMillan, F. (2007). The role of lexical cohesion in the assessment of EFL reading proficiency. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, *14*, 75-93.

Martin, C. R. (1997). *Looking at type: The fundamentals*. Centre for Applications of Psychological Type.

Matthews, G., & Gilliland, K. (1999). The personality theories of HJ Eysenck and JA Gray: A comparative review. *Personality and Individual differences*, 26(4), 583-626.

McCarley, N. G., & Carskadon, T. G. (1983). Test-retest reliabilities of scales and subscales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and of criteria for clinical interpretive hypotheses involving them. *Research in Psychological Type*, 6, 24-36.

McCaulley, M. H. (2000). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: A bridge between counseling and consulting. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *52*(2), 117.

McDonald, J. D. (2008). Measuring personality constructs: The advantages and disadvantages of self-reports, informant reports and behavioural assessments. *Enquire*, *1*(1), 1-19.

Medford, E., & McGeown, S. P. (2012). The influence of personality characteristics on children's intrinsic reading motivation. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *22*(6), 786-791.

Mehta, P., & Kumar, D. (1985). Relationships of academic achievement with intelligence, personality, adjustment, study habits and academic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Clinical Studies*. 1, 57–68.

Meyer, G. J., Finn, S. E., Eyde, L. D., Kay, G. G., Moreland, K. L., Dies, R. R., et al. (2001). Psychological testing and psychological assessment: A review of evidence and issues. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 128–165.

Miller, G. & Wrosch, G. (2007). You've gotta know when to fold 'em. Goal disengagement and systemic inflammation in adolescence. *Psychological Science, 18*(9), 773-775.

Millot, R., & Cranney, A. G. (1976). Personality correlates of college reading and study skills. *Journal of Reading Behaviour*, *8*(3), 335-336.

Murphy, K. R., & Davidshofer, C. O. (2005). *Psychological testing* (6th Ed). New York. USA: Pearson.

Myers, I. B. & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts Differing*. New York: CPP.

Myers, I. B. (1962). *Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. New Jersey: Educational Testing Service

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. New York: Consulting Psychologists Press. Retrieved from: http://sengifted.org/archives/articles/a-synthesis-of-research-on-psychological-types-of-gifted-adolescents#sthash.W2BgEyOH.dpuf

Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1993). *Gifts Differing: Understanding Personality Type*. New York: CPP.

Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998*). MBTI® Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator®*. New York: Mountain: CPP.

Myers, I., & Myers, P. (2010). *Gifts differing: Understanding personality type*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Naiman, N. (Ed.). (1978). *The good language learner* (Vol. 4). London: Multilingual Matters.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1978). The good language learner. *Research in Education Series*, 7.

Netter (2007) *Modern research on the neurochemical basis of individual differences rooted in Hans Eysenck's theory*. Paper at the ISSID conference, July

Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review,* 84, 231-259.

Olson, D. (1986) The cognitive consequences of literacy. *Canadian Psychology,* 27, 109–121.

Palomba, C. A., & Banta, T. W. (1999). *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education. Higher and Adult Education Series*. New York: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Paris, S. G., & Jacobs, J. E. (1984). The benefits of informed instruction for children's reading awareness and comprehension skills. *Child development*, 2083-2093.

Paris, S., Lipson, M., Wixon, K., (1983). Becoming a strategic reader. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 8, 293–316

Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction (3rd ed.)*. Columbia: TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Pennington, D. C. (2012). *Social cognition*. London: Routledge.

Personality assessment. (2016). In Encyclopædia Britannica. Retrieved from http://global.britannica.com/science/personality-assessment/Reliability-and-validity-of-assessment-methods

Peters, M. J., Howard, K., & Sharp, M. J. A. (2012). *The management of a student research project.* Farnham: Gower Publishing, Ltd.

Pfister, A. (2000). *The effect of personality type of bilingual students on English reading performance in a computer driven developmental reading laboratory: Implications for educational leaders.* Boston: The University of Boston.

Philips, J.L. (2000). *How to think about statistics* (6th Ed.). New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Pickering, A. D. and Gay, J. A. (1999). *The neuroscience of personality. In Handbook of personality theory and research* (Second edition) (ed. L. A. Perrin and O.P. John), (pp. 277–99). New York: Guilford Press.

Pittenger, D. J. (2005). Cautionary comments regarding the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 57(3), 210.

Polit, D.F., Beck, C.T. and Hungler, B.P. (2001*), Essentials of Nursing Research: Methods, Appraisal and Utilization*. (5th Ed)., Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Powers, D. E., & Yan, F. (2013). *TOEIC Bridge™ Scores: Validity Evidence From Korea and Japan*.

Pressley, M. (2002). *Reading instruction that really works: The case for balanced reading (2nd ed.)*. New York: Guilford Press.

Pressley, M., Beard El-Dinary, P., Brown, R., (1992). Skilled and not-so-skilled reading: good information processing or not-so-good processing. In: Pressley, M., Harris, K., Guthrie, J. (Eds.), *Promoting Academic Competence and Literacy in School*. (pp. 91–127). New York: Academic Press.

Quenk, N. L. (2009). *Essentials of Myers-Briggs type indicator assessment* (Vol. 66). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Rankin, E. F. (1963). *Reading test performance of introverts and extraverts*. Twelfth Yearbook of the *National Reading Conference*, Milwaukee: National Reading Conference.

Razali, N. M., & Wah, Y. B. (2011). Power comparisons of shapiro-wilk, kolmogorov-smirnov, lilliefors and anderson-darling tests. *Journal of statistical modeling and analytics,* 2(1), 21-33.

Reiff, J., (1992). *Learning Styles. (What Research Says to the Teacher.).* Washington, D.C: National Education Assn.

Revelle, W. (1997). Extraversion and impulsivity: The lost dimension? In H. Nyborg (Ed.), *The scientific study of human nature: Tribute to Hans J. Eysenck at eighty* (pp. 189-212). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (Third Edition.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Rieff, P. (1966). C. G. JUNG. The Collected Works, Vol. 10: Civilization in Transition; Vol. 11: Mysterium Coniunctionis: An Inquiry into the Separation and Synthesis of Psychic Opposites in Alchemy; Vol. 16: The Practice of Psychotherapy: Essays on the Psychology of the Transference and Other Subjects. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Pp. xxxvii, 1,699. New York: Pantheon Books. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 366(1), 199-201. doi:10.1177/000271626636600180

Rilcy, R. (2008). *Achieve TOEIC Bridge: Test-preparation Guide*. Oxford.: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, D. L. (1985). How personality relates to intelligence test performance: Implications for a theory of intelligence, ageing research and personality assessment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6(2), 203-216.

Robinson, D. L. (1986). The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale and personality assessment: Towards a biologically based theory of intelligence and cognition. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 7(2), 153-159.

Robinson, D., Gabriel, N., & Katchan, O. (1994). Personality and second language learning. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 16, 143-157.

Robinson, J. M. (1985). Style and personality in the literary work. *The Philosophical Review*, 94(2), 227-247.

Roth, W. M. (2014). Reading activity, consciousness, personality dialectically: Cultural-historical activity theory and the centrality of society. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *21*(1), 4-20.

Roth, W.-M. (2012). Rules of bending, bending the rules: the geometry of electrical conduit bending in college and workplace. *Educational Studies in Mathematics.* doi:10.1007/s10649-011-9376-4

Rothstein, M. G., Paunonen, S. V., Rush, J. C., & King, G. A. (1994). Personality and cognitive ability predictors of performance in graduate business school. *Journal of educational psychology*, *86*(4), 516.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1977). *Toward an interactive model of reading*. In S. Dornic (Ed.), Attention and performance VI (pp. 573-603). California. USA: Erlbaum.

Rushton, S., Morgan, J., & Richard, M. (2007). Teacher's Myers-Briggs personality profiles: Identifying effective teacher personality traits. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *23*(4), 432-441.

Sadeghi, N., Kasim, Z. M., Tan, B. H., & Abdullah, F. S. (2012).Learning styles, personality types and reading comprehension performance. *English Language Teaching*, 5(4), 116-123

Sak, U. (2004). A synthesis of research on psychological types of gifted adolescents. *Prufrock Journal*, *15*(2), 70-79.

Salkind, N. J. (2006). *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics*. Washington DC: Sage Publications.

Schaubhut, N. A., Herk, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2009). *MBTI® Form M manual supplement.* California: CPP, Inc.

Schaubhut, N. A., Herk, N. A., & Thompson, R. C. (2010). *MBTI form M manual supplement.* California: CPP, Inc.

Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Shapiro, S. S., & Wilk, M. B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). *Biometrika*, 52(3/4), 591-611.

Sharp, A. (2002). Chinese L1 school children reading in English: the effects of rhetorical patterns. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14(2), 111-135.

Sharp, A. (2004). Language learning and awareness of personality type in Chinese settings. *Asian EFL Journal*, *6*(2), 1-13.

Sharp, D. (1987). *Personality types: Jung's model of typology* (Vol. 31) New York: Inner city books.

Sharp, D. (1991). *Jung lexicon. A primer of terms & concepts.* New York: Inner City.

Sharp, A. (2002). Chinese L1 schoolchildren reading in English: *The effects of rhetorical patterns. Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14(2), 111.

Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. *System*, *29*(4), 431-449.

Shuhnan, L. S. (1999). Professing educational scholarship. In E. C. Lagemann &L. S. Shulman (Eds.), *Issues in education research; problems and possibilities* (pp. l59-165). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Silver, H. F., Strong, R. W., & Perini, M. J. (2000*). So each may learn: Integrating learning styles and multiple intelligences.* Virginia: ASCD.

Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *13*(02), 275-298.

Smart, J. C., Elton, C. F., & Burnett, C. W. (1970). Underachiever's and Overachievers in Intermediate French. *The Modern Language Journal*, *54*(6), 415-420.

Soto, C., & Jackson, J. (2013). Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Oxford Bibliographies in Psychology.* doi: 10.1093/obo/9780199828340-0120.

Spolsky, B. (1995). *Measured words: The development of objective language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spoto, A. (1995). *Jung's typology in perspective*. North Carolina: Chiron Publications.

Stelmack, R. M. (1990). Biological bases of extraversion psychophysiological evidence. *Journal of personality*, 58(1), 293-311.

Stelmack, R. M. (1997). Toward a paradigm in personality: Comment on Eysenck's view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1238-1241.

Stenberg, G., Risberg, J., Warkentin, S., & Rosén, I. (1990). Regional patterns of cortical blood flow distinguish extraverts from introverts. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 11(7), 663-673.

Stenberg, G., Wendt, P. E., & Risberg, J. (1993). Regional cerebral blood flow and extraversion. *Personality and individual differences*, *15*(5), 547-554.

Sternberg, R. J. (1999). *Thinking styles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (1997). Are cognitive styles still in style?. *American psychologist*, *52*(7), 700.

Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2000). Practical intelligence and its development. *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory development, assessment, and application at home school and in the workplace*, 215-43.

Stewart, J., Gibson, A., & Fryer, L. (2012). Examining the reliability of a TOEIC Bridge practice test under 1-and 3-parameter item response models. *Shiken Research Bulletin* 16(2), 8-14.

Stier, D. S., & Hall, J. A. (1984). Gender differences in touch: An empirical and theoretical review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*(2), 440.

Strelau, J. (1984). Temperament and personality. *Personality psychology in Europe. Theoretical and empirical developments,* 303-315.

Strieker, L. J., & Ross, J. (1962). *A description and evaluation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.* New Jersey: Princeton, Educational Testing Service.

Teale, W. H., & Rowley, G. (1984). *Standardized Testing and the Teaching of Reading: A Practical Guide with Evaluations of Reading Tests Commonly Used in Australian Schools.* Edmonton: University of Alberta.

The Access Center: Improving Outcomes for All Students K-8. (2005). Early Reading Assessment: A Guiding Tool for Instruction. New York: The Access Center.

The PCI and Why Indicator and Trait Instrument Are Animals From Completely Different Species!. (2016). *Personality Assessments By Gayle.* Retrieved from http://personalityassessmentsbygayle.weebly.com/go-read-it/the-pci-and-why indicator-and-trait-instrument-are-animals-from-completely-different-species.

The Myers & Briggs Foundation. (2016). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.myersbriggs.org/

Thomas, A., & Chess, S. (1977). *Temperament and Development.* New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Thomdike, E. L. (1914). Units and scales for measuring educational products. Proceedings of a Conference on Educational Measurements. *Indiana University Bulletin.* 72(10), 128-141.

Treiman, R. (2001), *Bottom-up and top-down processing in reading.* Michigan. USA: Wayne State University. Retrived from https://pages.wustl.edu/files/pages/imce/readingandlanguagelab/Treiman%20(2001)%20-%20Reading.pdf.

Tyagi, M. S. (2008). *Introduction to semiconductor materials and devices.* New York.USA: John Wiley & Sons.

UNESCO, E. (2006). *Global Monitoring Report: Literacy for Life.* Paris: United Nations Educational.

Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in second language: product, process and practice.* Harlow: Longman.

Van Dijk, T. A. & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension.* New York: Academic Press.

Van Teijlingen, E., & Hundley, V. (2002). The importance of pilot studies. *Nursing Standard*, 16(40), 33-36.

Vellutino, F. R., & Scanlon, D. M. (1982). Verbal processing in poor and normal readers. In *Verbal processes in children* (pp. 189-264). New York: Springer.

Vu, L. T., & Vu, P. H. (2013). Is the TOEFL Score a Reliable Indicator of International Graduate Students' Academic Achievement in American Higher Education?. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature A Bi Monthly Published, Online International Journal*, 11.

Wakamoto, N. (2009). *Extroversion/introversion in foreign language learning: Interactions with learner strategy use* (Vol. 67). Bern: Peter Lang.

Weiner, I. B., & Greene, R. L. (2011). *Handbook of personality assessment*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Wheeler, P. (2001). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and applications to accounting education and research. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 16(1), 125-150.

Williams, E. (n.d.). (2004). Literacy Studies. *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 576-603. doi:10.1002/9780470757000.ch23.

Wilson, C. (2013). *A Primer For Mixing Introverts & Extroverts In The Classroom.* Retrieved from http://www.teachthought.com/uncategorized/a-primer-for-mixing-introverts-and-extroverts-in-the-classroom/.

Wilson, T. (2002). *Strangers to ourselves: Discovering the adaptive unconscious*. Massachusetts: Belknap Press.

Wilson, T. (2009). Know thyself. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*(4), 384-389.

Winter, D. G., John, O. P., Stewart, A. J., Klohnen, E. C, & Duncan, L. E. (1998). Traits and motives: Toward an integration of two traditions in personality research. *Psychological Review*, 105, 230-250.

Yang, C. Y. (2007). *An analysis of the English reading comprehension tests in the basic competence test and the instruction of the reading skills and strategies in class* (Doctoral dissertation, Department of English, National Chengchi University).

Yerkes, R. M. & Dodson, J. D. (1908). The Relationship of Strength of Stimulus to Rapidity of Habit Formation. *Journal of Comparative Neurology and Psychology.* 18, 459-482.

Yu, X. J. (1995). An investigation of the Chinese perspective of conflict and conflict management. Paper presented at the 5th *International Conference on Cross Cultural Communication*: East and West, Harbin.

Zhang, H. (2010). *Assessing test Reliability: Comparing Two Versions of Reading Comprehension Test in the TOEFL test.* School of Teacher Education English IV.

Zhicheng, Z. (1992). The effects of teaching reading strategies on improving reading comprehension for ESL learners. Tuscaloosa: ERIC Document Reproduction.