

The Impact of Teacher-Selected vs. Student-Selected Discussion Groups on Speaking Fluency of Extrovert vs. Introvert Iranian EFL Learners

Masoomeh Salehi and Laleh Fakhraee Faruji and Anahita Salimian

Department of English Language, Shahr-e-Qods Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

This study aimed at comparing the impact of teacher-selected vs. student-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency of extrovert vs. introvert Iranian EFL learners. In order to do the study, 80 homogenous students were selected from among 140 intermediate female English language learners through the Oxford Placement Test. Then they were divided into introvert and extrovert learners based on the results of the extrovert and introvert questionnaire, and they were totally divided into four groups, namely extrovert student-selected, introvert student-selected, extrovert teacher-selected, and introvert teacher-selected. The participants in all groups took part in the speaking pretest. To do the discussion activities during the treatment process, the participants in the student-selected groups choose their groupmates themselves, while in the teacher-selected groups, the group members were chosen by the teacher. Finally, the participants took part in the posttest of speaking, and the obtained data were analyzed. The results of the analyses showed that selecting discussion groups by both students and teacher affected speaking fluency of extrovert and introvert learners. The results also confirmed that extrovert learners, in both student-selected groups and teacher-selected groups, outweighed the introvert learners regarding their speaking fluency. Teachers are, therefore, recommended to use both teacher-selected and student-selected discussion groups in their classes. They are also recommended to encourage introvert students to take part more actively in class discussions to obtain better results in improving their speaking.

Keywords: speaking fluency, English as a foreign language, extroversion, introversion

Introduction

There are four types of skills that people need for learning a language to complete communication. People start learning their native language by learning to listen first, then to speak, then to read, and finally to write; therefore, there are four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The four language skills are related to each other in two ways: the direction of communication (reception or production), and the method of communication (oral or written). The four language skills are sometimes called the "micro-skills", which are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Unfortunately, learning a second language generally causes trouble for different learners.

The main objective of English teaching is to expand the students' four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing, as well as the base of essential phonetics, an adequate amount of vocabulary and grammar. For many people, the most important function of any language is communication with other people when traveling, studying, or working in a foreign country. Among four language skills, speaking plays a vital role and anybody who likes to learn English likes to speak in English first. It has been largely held that real success in English language teaching and learning is when the learner can communicate in English inside and outside the classroom (Davies & Pearse, 2000). Alharbi (2015) said the English language plays a vital role in the modern world. Similarly, Nunan (1991) stated that success in language learning is measured in terms of the ability to carry out a conversation in the (target) language. Similarly, Chastain (1988) put forward speaking plays a vital role in learning to use language to communicate.

Besides, according to Nunan (1991), speaking is vital to human communication and English language learners, no matter how much they know about the English language, still face

many speaking difficulties. Therefore, if students do not learn how to speak or do not get the opportunity to speak in the language classroom, they may soon get demotivated and lose interest in learning. Consequently, teachers have been studying the ways of enabling learners to use English fluently, effectively, and as far as possible accurately, in real communication, which has become not only the major goal of all English language teaching but also the student main concern when they make their efforts to study English (Kasap, 2005).

Furthermore, fluency is one of the crucial subskills of speaking ability and it is considered as the natural use of language when a speaker engages in meaningful interaction and maintains comprehensible and ongoing communication despite limitations in his or her communicative competence (Skehan, 1996). According to Skehan (1996), fluency is the learners' ability to produce language without extreme hesitation and pauses in their speaking and communication. Skehan said that fluency can be developed by creating classroom activities in which students negotiate meaning, use communication strategies, correct misunderstandings, and work to avoid communication breakdowns. In line with the importance of fluency, Kasap (2005) mentioned some factors which may affect fluency. Kasap focused more on other subskills of speaking (i.e., accuracy and complexity) and said that they may overlook fluency. Kasap also added that different personality factors such as production anxiety, embarrassment, shyness, and feelings of inadequacy of one's ideas also are other factors that affect fluency.

Moreover, there are significant differences in behavior related with individual variances along the introversion-extraversion continuum, and they learn and practice in a different way (Hjelle & Ziegler, 1992); consequently, they may need different types of teaching and activities in speaking to be able to develop their fluency.

Review of the Literature

There is an abundance of studies in the literature investigating the methods for improving speaking in EFL learners. Pishkar, Moinzadeh, and Dabaghi' (2017), for instance, reported the effect of using drama on speaking fluency and accuracy. They said that in teaching-learning processes, drama method may have some positive effects on ELL students' speaking fluency and accuracy. Their study attempted to probe one of the main concerns of language learners, that is, how to improve their speaking components, e.g., oral fluency and accuracy. The researchers investigated the effect of two selected texts from modern English dramas on students' speaking fluency and accuracy. They distinguished fluent from non-fluent and accurate from no accurate learners. Therefore, their study was designed as a true experimental research and the data were gathered from 60 EFL students, whose ages were between 19-25 (80 percent girls and 20 percent boys), of English language and literature at Hormozgan University in Iran. The data were the recorded speaking transcripts which were analyzed to show the probable progresses after four-time (10 weeks) treatment. The factors to be considered in their study were the numbers of filled and unfilled pauses in each narration, the total number of words per minute, mean length of utterance, and number of stressed words. The results were compared and their temporal and linguistic measures were correlated with their fluency scores. They revealed that the speech rate, the mean length of utterance, phonation time ratio and the number of stressed words produced per minute were the best predictors of fluency scores, and thus, students' speaking fluency increased, whereas the students' speaking accuracy decreased in some areas of speaking abilities and oral communications.

Furthermore, in a study conducted by Mohammadi and Enayati (2018), the effects of lexical chunks teaching on EFL intermediate learners' speaking fluency is investigated. In their

study, after administrating the Quick Placement Test (QPT), 60 intermediate L2 learners were selected at random out of 120, and then assigned to two experimental and control groups. The learners were assigned an interview of ten questions as a pretest. After that some lessons of lexical chunks using (Collocation in Use and Common Idioms in English) books were thought as the treatment to the experimental group. After the instruction, an interview was conducted on both the experimental and control group as the post test. The T-test analyzed data of the post test revealed that after the treatment, the participants' fluency in the experimental group was significantly improved. The results also showed that the participants in the experimental group had positive attitudes toward explicit instruction of lexical chunks. The study has theoretical and pedagogical implications in the field of foreign/second language teaching and learning.

In addition, Namaziandost, Hashemifardnia, Shafiee, and Feng's (2019) study was an attempt to compare the effects of using opinion-gap, reasoning-gap, and information-gap tasks on Iranian EFL learners' speaking fluency. To fulfill this objective, 140 intermediate EFL learners were selected and subsequently divided into three experimental groups including opinion-gap group, reasoning-gap group, and information-gap group, plus one control group. Afterward, the participants of all the groups were given a speaking pre-test, followed by the intervention, where the experimental groups received their specific treatments and the control group was exposed to the placebo. After the intervention ended, a speaking post-test was given to all the groups in order to measure the effects of the treatments on their speaking fluency. The results of one-way ANOVA indicated that the three experimental groups outperformed the control group on the posttest. In addition, the results uncovered that information-gap tasks were more effective than opinion-gap tasks and reasoning-gap tasks. In light of these findings, the researchers suggested some

recommendations that are hoped to help syllabus designers, supervisors and English language teachers in developing teaching speaking skills.

Moreover, Nasri, Namaziandost, and Akbari's (2019) study examined the effect of pictorial cues on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' speaking accuracy and fluency. To do this study, 54 Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners were selected out of 80 students in a private English Language Institute. The selected participants were divided into two equal groups; experimental group and control group. After that, both groups were pretested by a speaking pre-test. The experimental group was taught through using the pre-speaking strategies as the researcher provided students with pictorial inputs. On the other hand, the students of the control group were taught through traditional speaking activities including repetition and over-learning. The treatment took 15 sessions of 50 minutes each under the guidance of the supervisor. In the first session, the participants were homogenized. In the second session, they were pretested. During 11 sessions, students were taught by using pictorial input, and in the last session after the treatment the two groups took the speaking post-test. The results of paired t-test and MANOVA revealed that the experimental group had better performance on their accuracy and fluency post-test compared to their pre-test. The results also showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group on the accuracy and fluency post-test. Finally, implications arising from the findings and suggestions for further research were explained.

Research Questions

There are a number of studies in the literature which have suggested different strategies to aid EFL learners to develop their fluency. A few of these studies were reviewed above. However, the researchers could not find a specific study concerning the effect of teacher-selected vs. student-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency. Therefore, this study aimed to compare the impact

of teacher-selected vs. student-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency of extrovert vs. introvert Iranian EFL learners. To be more exact, the following research questions were addressed in this study.

RQ1. Do teacher-selected discussion groups have a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of extrovert learners?

RQ2. Do teacher-selected discussion groups have a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of introvert learners?

RQ3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the effect of teacher-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency of extrovert vs. introvert learners?

RQ4. Do student-selected discussion groups have a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of extrovert learners?

RQ5. Do student-selected discussion groups have a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of introvert learners?

RQ6. Is there a statistically significant difference between the effect of student-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency of extrovert vs. introvert learners?

Method

Participants

To conduct the present study, 140 intermediate female English language learners from Mehr English language institute in Shahriar whose age ranged from 13 to 17 were asked to take part in the Oxford Placement Test (OPT). Then, to choose 80 homogeneous participants, the students whose scores fell one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected. At that time, they were required to answer the questions of the extrovert and introvert questionnaire, and they were divided into introvert and extrovert learners based on the results of the questionnaire.

Each group of introvert and extrovert learners were assigned randomly and equally into two groups of 20 learners, and they formed four groups, namely extrovert student-selected, introvert student-selected, extrovert teacher-selected, and introvert teacher-selected groups.

Instruments

To conduct this study, the following instruments were used.

Oxford Placement Test (OPT)

To check the homogeneity of the participants, the OPT was used in the current study. It is a test of English language proficiency developed by Oxford University Press and Cambridge ESOL that gives teachers a reliable and time-saving method of finding a student's level of English (Hill & Taylor, 2004). It is quick and easy to administer and is ideal for placement testing and examination screening and takes approximately 60 minutes to administer. All the questions of the test are in multiple-choice format; answers are recorded directly on the answer sheet, and the answer sheets can be quickly marked using the overlays provided. The test assesses the knowledge of English structure, and also is considered as a global measure of ability in the English language or other content areas. The test enjoys high reliability ($\alpha=.91$) based on Cronbach's alpha. The test has been also reported to enjoy high construct validity (Nematizadeh, 2011; Wistner, Sakai, & Abe, 2009).

Extroversion and Introversion Questionnaire

A questionnaire which is proposed by Cain (2013) was used to identify the participants' personality. It includes 12 true-false questions. If the majority of the questions are true, the responder is probably an introvert. If the questions are evenly, true and false, the responder is

probably an ambivert, and if the majority of the questions are false, the responder is probably an extrovert.

Pretest and Posttest of Speaking Fluency

The participants in each group participated in a pretest and a posttest. The speaking tests in pre- and posttest were IELTS speaking task and each participant needed to talk about 2-3 minutes. The learners' answers were recorded and rated by two expert teachers via the IELTS Speaking scoring rubric.

Speaking Scoring Rubric

The speaking fluency of each participant was rated via using the IELTS scoring rubric. This rubric includes 4 parts, fluency and coherence, lexical resources, grammatical range and accuracy, and pronunciation. Two expert English language teachers were asked to rate the participants' speaking based on the fluency and coherence part of this rubric. Table 1 shows the description of the fluency and coherence part of the IELTS speaking scoring rubric.

Table 1

Fluency and Coherence of IELTS Speaking Scoring Rubric

9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •speaks fluently with only rare repetition or self-correction; •any hesitation is content-related rather than to find words or grammar •speaks coherently with fully appropriate cohesive features •develops topics fully and appropriately
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •speaks fluently with only occasional repetition or self-correction; hesitation is usually content-related and only rarely to search for language •develops topics coherently and appropriately
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •speaks at length without noticeable effort or loss of coherence

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •may demonstrate language-related hesitation at times, or some repetition and/or self-correction •uses a range of connectives and discourse markers with some flexibility
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •is willing to speak at length, though may lose coherence at times due to occasional repetition, self-correction or hesitation •uses a range of connectives and discourse markers but not always appropriately
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •usually maintains flow of speech but uses repetition, self-correction and/or slow speech to keep going •may over-use certain connectives and discourse markers •produces simple speech fluently, but more complex communication causes fluency problems
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •cannot respond without noticeable pauses and may speak slowly, with frequent repetition and self-correction •links basic sentences but with repetitious use of simple connectives and some breakdowns in coherence
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •speaks with long pauses •has limited ability to link simple sentences •gives only simple responses and is frequently unable to convey basic message
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •pauses lengthily before most words •little communication possible
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •no communication possible •no ratable language
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •does not attend

Voice Recorder

To record the voice of participants in the pre- and posttest, a voice record was used. Then, the voice of each participant was rated by two expert teachers.

Procedure

To achieve the purpose of the study, first of all, in order to choose 80 homogeneous participants, the researchers asked 140 English language learners at the intermediate level of proficiency to take part in the OPT test. The allotted time to take the test was sixty minutes. After the OPT test, the participants whose scores fell one standard deviation above and below the mean were invited to answer the questions of the introvert-extrovert questionnaire. At that moment, forty introvert and forty extrovert participants were chosen and they were divided into four groups, each group containing 20 participants. These groups were called extrovert student-selected, introvert student-selected, extrovert teacher-selected, and introvert teacher-selected groups.

All the participants were asked to take part in the speaking test as the pretest and their voice was recorded and rated by two expert teachers who had more than 10 years of experience in English language teaching (ELT). Besides, the inter-rater reliability was also computed.

In the student-selected groups, the participants were asked to choose their groupmates themselves for classroom discussion. The participants made five groups, each group containing 4 students. The period of treatment sessions was ten ninety-minute sessions. In each session, thirty minutes were allotted for discussion. The topics of discussion of each session are listed in Table 2. Before starting the discussion, the teacher did a brainstorming for 5 minutes and then asked the participants to work in groups. The teacher monitored their speaking activity and gave feedback on language and content when they needed. The procedure in both extrovert student-selected and introvert student-selected groups was the same.

In the teacher-selected groups, the teacher formed five groups, each group containing four students. They also had 30-minute discussion starting with a brainstorming activity about the given

topic. The topics of the discussion were the same as the topics of student-selected group. The procedure in both extrovert teacher-selected and introvert teacher-selected groups was the same.

After 10 sessions, the participants had a speaking test as the posttest, and their voice was recorded and rated by two raters like rating the pretests.

Table 2

List of Topics for Group Discussion

No	Topics
1	Does technology make us more alone?
2	Should students be able to grade their teachers?
3	Do teachers assign too much homework?
4	Can money buy you happiness?
5	Can cellphones be educational tools?
6	Is school designed more for girls than boys?
7	Should parents let their children play online games?
8	Should companies collect information about us?
9	Do laws that ban offensive words make the world a better place?
10	Should reading and math be taught in gym class too?

Design

As it was not possible to choose the participants of the study randomly, the study was as a quasi-experimental, four experimental groups without a control group, pretest-posttest design. The independent variables were student-selected groups and teacher-selected groups and speaking fluency was the dependent variable. The introversion and extroversion were the intervening variables.

Results

This part includes the results of the normality test, the paired-samples t-test which was used to compare the results of groups in the pre- and the posttests, and one-way ANCOVA.

Normality Test

In order to select an appropriate statistical method to answer the research questions of the study, the normality of the data was checked first. To check the normality of the data, the researchers employed one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, which shows that a variable is not normally distributed if '*Sig.*' < 0.05 (Pallant, 2013). Table 3 shows the results of the normality test.

Table 1

Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Pretest	extrovert student-selected	.216	20	.016
	introvert student-selected	.216	20	.016
	extrovert teacher-selected	.226	20	.019
	introvert teacher-selected	.225	20	.019
Posttest	extrovert student-selected	.122	20	.200*
	introvert student-selected	.109	20	.200*
	extrovert teacher-selected	.228	20	.018
	introvert teacher-selected	.112	20	.200*

There were totally eight groups of data which were gathered by pre- and posttest and as the numbers in *Sig.* column in the above table show, the results had a normal distribution ($p = .016, .016, .019, .019, .200, .200, .018, .200$; $p > .05$); therefore, parametric tests such as a paired-samples t-test and an independent-samples t-test could be applied.

Addressing the First Research Question

In order to find out whether teacher-selected discussion groups had a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of extrovert learners, the researcher ran the paired-samples t-test. Table 4 shows the mean scores of the extrovert teacher-selected group in the pretest ($M=5.02$) and the posttest ($M=5.65$).

Table 2

Paired-Samples Statistics of Extrovert Teacher-Selected Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	5.0250	20	.49404	.11047
	Posttest	5.6500	20	.29469	.06589

Table 5 indicates that there was a statistically significant difference between the pretest and the posttest ($P<0.05$, $P=.01$).

Table 4.3

Paired-Samples T-Test of Extrovert Teacher-Selected Group

Paired Differences		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower	Upper					
Pretest - Posttest	-.62500	.37258	.08331	-.79937	-.45063	-7.502	19	.000	

Therefore, the first null hypothesis was rejected, and it was confirmed that teacher-selected discussion groups had a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of extrovert learners.

Addressing the Second Research Question

To test whether teacher-selected discussion groups had a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of introvert learners, the researcher also employed the paired-samples t-test. Table 6 displays the mean scores of the introvert teacher-selected group in the pretest ($M=5.10$) and the posttest ($M=5.30$).

Table 4

Paired-Samples Statistics of Introvert Teacher-Selected Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 2	Pretest	5.1000	20	.72184	.16141
	Posttest	5.3000	20	.50783	.11355

Table 7 shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the pretest and the posttest ($P<0.05$, $P=.01$).

Table 5

Paired-Samples T-Test of Introvert Teacher-Selected Group

Paired Differences								
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper		
Pretest	Posttest	-.20000	.24061	.05380	-.31261	-.08739	-3.717	.001

Therefore, the second null hypothesis was rejected, and it was confirmed that teacher-selected discussion groups had a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of introvert learners.

Addressing the Third Research Question

To test whether there was a statistically significant difference between the effect of teacher-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency of extrovert vs. introvert learners, the researcher computed the one-way ANCOVA. Table 8 shows the mean scores of the extrovert teacher-selected group ($M=5.65$) and the introvert teacher-selected group ($M=5.30$) in the posttest.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Teacher-Selected Groups in the Posttest

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
extrovert teacher-selected	5.6500	.29469	20
introvert teacher-selected	5.3000	.50783	20
Total	5.4750	.44650	40

Table 9 displays that there was a statistically significant difference between the introvert teacher-selected group and the extrovert teacher-selected group in the posttest ($P<.05$, $P=.01$).

Table 7

One Way ANCOVA of the Teacher-Selected Groups

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Squared	Eta Squared
Corrected Model	6.402 ^a	2	3.201	86.235	.000	.823	
Intercept	3.368	1	3.368	90.747	.000	.710	
Pre_test	5.177	1	5.177	139.467	.000	.790	
Group	1.552	1	1.552	41.822	.000	.531	

Error	1.373	37	.037
Total	1206.800	40	
Corrected Total	7.775	39	

a. R Squared = .823 (Adjusted R Squared = .814)

The above analyses indicate that the extrovert teacher-selected group outperformed the introvert teacher-selected group; consequently, the third null hypothesis was rejected, and it was confirmed that there was a statistically significant difference between the effect of teacher-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency of extrovert vs. introvert learners.

Addressing the Fourth Research Question

To check whether student-selected discussion groups had a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of extrovert learners, the researchers employed the paired-samples t-test. Table 10 shows the mean scores of the extrovert student-selected group in the pretest ($M=4.95$) and the posttest ($M=5.17$).

Table 8

Paired-Samples Statistics Extrovert Student-Selected Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	4.9500	20	.59161	.13229
	Posttest	5.1750	20	.60164	.13453

Table 11 shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the pretest and the posttest ($P<0.05$, $P=.01$).

Table 9

Paired-Samples T-Test of Extrovert Student-Selected Group

Paired Differences		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower	Upper					
Pretest Posttest	-.22500	.10195	.02280	-.27272	-.17728	-9.869	19	.000	

Therefore, the fourth null hypothesis was rejected, and it was confirmed that student-selected discussion groups had a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of extrovert learners.

Addressing the Fifth Research Question

To check whether student-selected discussion groups had a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of introvert learners, the researcher used the paired-samples t-test. Table 12 shows the mean scores of the introvert student-selected group in the pretest ($M=5.00$) and the posttest ($M=5.07$).

Table 10

Paired-Samples Statistics Introvert Student-Selected Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 2	Pretest	5.0000	20	.66491	.14868
	Posttest	5.0750	20	.69727	.15591

Table 13 shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the pretest and the posttest ($P < 0.05$, $P = .04$).

Table 11

Paired-Samples T-Test of Introvert Student-Selected Group

	Paired Differences		Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation		Lower	Upper			
Pretest Posttest	-.07500	.15174	.03393	-.14602	-.00398	-2.210	19	.040

Consequently, the fifth null hypothesis was rejected, and it was confirmed that student-selected discussion groups had a statistically significant effect on speaking fluency of introvert learners.

Addressing the Sixth Research Question

To find out whether there was a statistically significant difference between the effect of student-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency of extrovert vs. introvert learners, the researchers computed the one-way ANCOVA. Table 14 displays the mean scores of the extrovert student-selected group ($M = 5.17$) and the introvert student-selected group ($M = 5.07$) in the posttest.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics of Student-Selected Groups in the Posttest

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
extrovert student-selected	5.1750	.60164	20
introvert student-selected	5.0750	.69727	20
Total	5.1250	.64480	40

Table 15 shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the introvert student-selected group and the extrovert student-selected group in the posttest ($P < .05$, $P = .01$).

Table 13

One Way ANCOVA of the Student-Selected Groups

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Squared	Eta
Corrected Model	15.583 ^a	2	7.792	456.202	.000	.961	
Intercept	.004	1	.004	.218	.643	.006	
Pretest	15.483	1	15.483	906.548	.000	.961	
Group	.227	1	.227	13.278	.001	.264	
Error	.632	37	.017				
Total	1066.840	40					
Corrected Total	16.215	39					

a. R Squared = .961 (Adjusted R Squared = .959)

The above analyses show that the extrovert student-selected group outperformed the introvert student-selected group; consequently, the sixth null hypothesis was rejected, and it was confirmed that there was a statistically significant difference between the effect of student-selected discussion groups on speaking fluency of extrovert vs. introvert learners.

Discussion

The existing results in the previous sections give the impression to propose that selecting discussion groups by both students and teacher affected speaking fluency of extrovert and introvert learners. The results also confirmed that extrovert learners, in both student-selected groups and teacher-selected groups, outweighed the introvert learners regarding their speaking fluency.

Speaking is one of abilities in English learning which is required to communicate to one another. Some students usually face difficulties to speak. On the other hand, some other students are active in speaking in their classroom. One of causes of those problems relates to the personality. Based on dimensions of attitude, there are two types of personalities, such as extrovert and introvert personality. This study showed that the extrovert learners, as they tend to communicate with others more, could develop their speaking fluency more.

The results of the current study are in line with some previous studies. For instance, the study conducted by Hilton and Phillips (2010) through qualitative and quantitative analyses found that student-selected groups perceived greater similarities among group members, along several dimensions including backgrounds, interests, project commitment, and ability to succeed as a group. Their study suggested that group activities in which the group members were selected by the students themselves could be more successful in doing different activities. But the results of the current study revealed that both student-selected and teacher-selected discussion groups had a significant effect on speaking fluency of learners.

The results of the current study were also in line with the results of the study conducted by Rachmawaty and Hermagustiana (2015). The aim of their study was to find out the effect of

retelling on the students' speaking fluency and to know the strategies used by those students while retelling a story. The data were the speaking transcripts which were analyzed to see the progress after six-time treatment was given. The result revealed that the speaking fluency of the students increased in some areas as shown by the improvement on their vocabulary and comprehensibility.

Mozaffari's (2017) study aimed at answering this question that whether assigning the partner by a teacher or students themselves could be an effective factor or not in pair/group work. Therefore, he performed his study to discover who can best form high performance groups. His findings suggested that the teacher-assigned pairs generated significantly more successful in collaborative writing than the student-selected pairs, while there was no significant difference in the patterns of interaction between the two pairing methods. In line with the findings of Mozaffari, the current study showed that selecting group discussions by both teacher and students could be effective in developing the speaking fluency of learners.

In line with the results of this study are the results of the study conducted by Albino (2017). Albino's study attempted to assess how learners of English as a foreign language improved their speaking fluency in a task-based language teaching approach. In a case study design that used picture-description tasks, learners' speeches were audio recorded before and after the teaching, in which recasts and prompts were utilized as feedback tools for 8 weeks. The findings indicated that learners improved in terms of their speaking fluency by maximizing their speed of speech production, increasing grammatical accuracy, elaborating on their utterances, and developing interactional language.

The results of the study with regard to the speaking fluency are in line with the results of the study conducted by Nasri et al. (2019). Their study examined the effect of pictorial cues on

Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' speaking accuracy and fluency. They found the effectiveness of using pictorial cues on speaking fluency of EFL learners. In their study, they did not talk about group work activity while the current study focused on group work activity and its impact on speaking fluency.

Conclusion

This study showed that both teacher-selected and student-selected discussion groups affected speaking fluency of EFL learner; therefore, both strategies can be used in groups selection.

This study also confirmed that, the extrovert groups, in both student-selected and teacher-selected groups outweighed the introvert groups, and it was revealed that this factor could be effective in developing speaking fluency, and it could be because of the tendency to communicate and interact with other people.

The results of this study could be significant for different people from different aspects. Firstly, the results of the study could be significant for English language teachers. They can apply this strategy in group discussions to aid the learners in developing the learner speaking fluency.

In addition, the results of the study could be significant for English language institutes. They can ask their teacher to apply this strategy in their classes to develop speaking fluency of learners.

Finally, this study could be significant for teacher trainers. They can introduce these techniques in their training courses to the teachers in order to be applied in their classes.

References

- Albino, G. (2017). Improving speaking fluency in a task-based language teaching approach: The case of EFL learners at PUNIV-Cazenga. *SAGE Open*, 7(2), 21-27. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2158244017691077>
- Alharbi, H. A. (2015). Improving students' English Speaking proficiency in Saudi public schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, 8(1), 105-116.
- Cain, S. (2013). *Quiet: The power of introverts in a world that can't stop talking*. Broadway Books.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills. Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Orlando: Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Davies, P., & Pearse, E. (2000). *Success in English teaching: A complete introduction to teaching English at secondary school level and above*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, N. E., & Taylor, L. C. (2004). Parental school involvement and children's academic achievement pragmatics and issues. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13(4), 161-164. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00298.x>
- Hilton, S., & Phillips, F. (2010). Instructor-assigned and student-selected groups: A view from inside. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 25(1), 15-33. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2308/iace.2010.25.1.15>
- Hjelle, L. A., & Ziegler, D. J. (1992). *Personality theories: Basic assumptions, research, and applications*. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Kasap, B. (2005). *The effectiveness of task-based instruction in the improvement of speaking*, (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Mozaffari, S. H. (2017). Comparing student-selected and teacher-assigned pairs on collaborative writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 21(4), 496-516. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816641703>
- Namaziandost, E., Hashemifardnia, A., Shafiee, S., & Feng, G. C. (2019). The impact of opinion-gap, reasoning-gap, and information-gap tasks on EFL learners' speaking fluency. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 5(1), 163-150. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2019.1630150>
- Nasri, M., Namaziandost, E., & Akbari, S. (2019). Impact of pictorial cues on speaking fluency and accuracy among Iranian pre-intermediate EF learners. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 8(3), 99-109. doi:<http://DOI:10.18488/journal.23.2019.83.99.109>

- Nematizadeh, S. (2011). *The relationship between gender and learner types and oral performance of Iranian EFL students*, (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Islamic Azad University Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual*. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pishkar, K., Moinzadeh, A., & Dabaghi, A. (2017). Modern English drama and the students' fluency and accuracy of speaking. *English Language Teaching*, 10(8), 69-77. doi:<http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n8p69>
- Rachmawaty, N., & Hermagustiana, I. (2015). Does retelling techniques improve speaking fluency. *Teflin Journal*, 21(1), 1-8. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v21i1/1-8>
- Skehan, P. (1996). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis, & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 17-30). London: Heinemann.
- Wistner, B., Sakai, H., & Abe, M. (2009). An analysis of the Oxford Placement Test and the Michigan English Placement Test as L2 proficiency tests. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters, Hosei University*, 58, 33-44. Retrieved from <http://www.academia.edu/download/>