

# The Impact of Explicit Instruction of Top-Down Reading Strategies on Reading Comprehension of Introvert vs. Extrovert Intermediate EFL Learners

Amir Reza Nemat Tabrizi<sup>1</sup>, Zeinab Rajabi<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

The present study aimed at investigating the effect of top-down processing on the reading comprehension of extrovert and introvert intermediate Iranian EFL learners. To pursue the purpose of the study, one hundred EFL learners (n=100) were selected randomly out of a total number of one hundred fifty (n=150) intermediate learners at Kerman's Mehr English language school; based on their scores on Nelson reading proficiency test. The participants were categorized into 4 subgroups based on Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) consisting of two intermediate introvert groups (one control and one experimental) and two intermediate extrovert learners (one control and one experimental) with twenty five (n=25) participants in each group. A piloted researcher- made reading test was administered as a posttest of reading after 10 sessions of treatment. To check the hypotheses of the study, the scores of four groups were compared using independent samples t-test and two-way ANOVA. The results approved that top-down processing instruction had a significant positive effect on reading comprehension of both introvert and extrovert Iranian EFL intermediate learners. In addition, more or less, introvert and extrovert learners benefited the same. Eventually, the findings of the study could be used by EFL teachers who aim at enhancing EFL learners reading skill and educational systems which are concerned with matched and mismatched classes in terms of learning styles.

**Keywords:** Reading Comprehension, Top-down Processing, Introvert Learners, Extrovert Learners

## 1. Introduction

Reading has been defined by different scholars in more or less the same way. Thorn bury (2006) defined reading as understanding meaning from the written text. Ur (1996) posited that reading is one of the major tools to understanding among language learners and a suitable way to enhance EFL learners' language skills. Reading is a primary source of vocabulary learning without which language classes would be severely void (Brown, 2000). Regardless of what the definition of reading is, reading is a major component of high-stake tests such as TOEFL, IELTS, CAE, etc. In fact, it is hard to deny that the academic success of students, especially in higher educational systems depends heavily on their reading ability.

Having established the significance of reading, it should be mentioned that people read for a variety of purposes. Some read as they find reading a joyful activity. Their reading attitude is often seized by the teacher as an opportunity to help them improve their language skills. This type of reading as confirmed by Harmer (2008) is referred to as extensive reading. However, some read for finding and understanding specific information given in a text. Of interest to these readers is detailed information, i.e., meaning of the words, specific information understanding, detailed understanding and inferential understanding which is referred to as intensive reading (Yazar, 2013). Brown (2001) has pointed to the fact that efficient reading consists of clearly identifying the purpose in reading the text. In this way, the reader will know what to look

---

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D, Assistant Prof., Department of English language, Payame Noor University, I. R. of Iran.

<sup>2</sup>Department of English language, Payame Noor University, I. R. of Iran.

for and can weed out potential distracting information. When a teacher teaches whatever reading techniques or reading strategies, he or she should make sure that students know what they are reading for (Brown, 2001).

Research into learner strategies has made an important contribution to the field of ELT and much of the research has tried to understand if it is possible to facilitate learning through the use of certain strategies or if it is possible for learners to modify strategies and use more effective ones (Hedge, 2000, p. 79). It means a person may have different personality type; however, regarding what type of personality type best suit them in that very case of learning, they decide to utilize the best one through modifying the most appropriate one.

Moreover, the personality type that has attracted the most attention in L2 research is extroversion/introversion (Dornyei, 2005). Brook (2011) characterizes the introvert as a state of being wholly or predominantly concerned with or interested in one's own mental life. He added extrovert is the act of being predominantly concerned with and obtaining gratification from what is outside the self. Introvert learners don't enjoy being with others; however, extroverts enjoy being with others and spending time with them. Help or hindrance of extrovert or introvert to the process of L2 acquisition is not clear (Brown, 2000). Extrovert and introvert can learn to work with each other with the help of the teacher in that the person in charge of leading the L2 discussion gives introvert an opportunity to participate equally with extrovert (Celce-murcia, 2001).

Despite the existence of different personality variables affecting L2 learning, one cannot ignore the role of approaches to learning a new skill. One of those approaches is Top-down Processing (T-d) model in comprehending a reading text. In T-d processing, the reader gets a general view of the reading by absorbing the overall picture (Harmer, 2008, p. 270). In T-d processing meaning is gained through the successful interaction between the reader and the text (Ajideh, 2003).

The present study aimed to explore the comparative influence of top-down processing model accompanied with tasks for the reading comprehension of extroverts and introverts. Based on the crucial importance of comprehension, the selected tasks were according to top-down processing model proposed by Brown (1989). The Following listed tasks were top-down processing in which students should get a general overview of the text: 1. Paraphrasing: in this task students should retell what they have grasped with the same meaning but with different structure 2. Using background knowledge and experience. What students have about the past about the title or thesis of the text is considered students' background knowledge which must be activated. 3. Prediction: here, some key words out of the text and/or the title of the text are put on the board for the student to see and predict what they will encounter whole through the reading text. 4. Note taking: in this task students should read the text silently for themselves and take notes from what they consider the gist.

As stated by (Celce-Murcia, 2001) the problem in many reading classes is that reading is viewed as a passive activity. This problem is also observable in the EFL context of Iran. In fact, there is a very trivial defined role for Iranian EFL learners in reading sessions of the class. Their main role, however, is to answer the reading comprehension questions. Though recent research has emphasized that reading is a complex activity and successful reading requires cognitive processing skills, schema-based understanding, and contextual clues (Hadley, 2003) none of which can be fulfilled if reading is viewed as a passive skill.

Another observable problem in reading classes in the context of Iran is that insufficient attention has been paid to the EFL learners' learning preferences and styles. Many language teachers are not aware of the fact that learning styles should be taken into account in language classes and that they may bring about major differences in the outcome of the course. As a result, although matched classes in terms of learning styles have been recommended, Iranian EFL classes are, in most cases, mismatched.

Finally, although the literature specific to reading comprehension is sparse, inadequate attention is paid to top down reading. Most recent research on reading comprehension deals with schema activation, and cognitive abilities of the learners. Though as opposed to other reading strategies, this strategy may be a useful on for the EFL context of Iran.

## **Research Questions**

In order to fulfill the purpose of this study, the following research questions would be formulated:

RQ1. Does instruction of top-down reading strategies have any impact on reading comprehension of intermediate EFL learners?

RQ2. Does instruction of top-down reading strategies have any impact on reading comprehension of introvert intermediate EFL Learners?

RQ3. Does instruction of top-down reading strategies have any impact on reading comprehension of extrovert intermediate EFL learners?

RQ4. If the answers to questions 2 and 3 are yes: Which type of learners benefits more?

## **Research Hypotheses**

In accordance with four above mentioned research questions, the following research hypotheses would be formulated:

H01: The instruction of top down reading strategies does not have any impact on the reading comprehension of intermediate EFL learners.

H02: The instruction of top down reading strategies does not have any impact on the reading comprehension of introvert intermediate EFL learners.

H03: The instruction of top down reading strategies does not have any impact on the reading comprehension of extrovert intermediate EFL learners.

H4: The instruction of top down reading strategies has more impact on the reading comprehension of extrovert learners than introvert intermediate EFL learners.

## **2. Review of Literature**

### **• Reading Comprehension**

Reading is not only reading a simple text but it is both the extraction and construction of meaning through interaction and involvement with written language which require the reader, the text, and the activity or the purpose for reading (Snow, 2002).

Reading comprehension is of paramount importance. According to Richards and Renandya (2002), reading has gathered the attention of many experts, researchers, learners because of a number of reasons:

- Firstly, Reading is one of the most crucial aims of foreign language learners because in this way they can read for knowledge, for their career, and for educational purposes.
- Secondly, reading texts is considered as pedagogical purposes because linguistic exposure to rich text not only increases the speed of language acquisition but also expose them to good writing samples.
- Thirdly, it also gives students time to be familiar with new points of discussion, to encourage speaking and to work on other skills such as vocabulary, grammar, idioms.

When we read a text, we don't solely read the lines with some words. As Grebe (2004, p19) suggested that "reading comprehension implies processing efficiency, language knowledge, strategic awareness, extensive practice in reading, cognitive resources in working memory to allow critical reflection, and appropriate purposes for reading".

Roe, Smith & Burns (2005) stated that if one wants to understand the reading text completely, he must use the clues in the text for inferential understanding and creative and critical reading, which means figuring out literary terms, deciding the author's intention, evaluating the stated views and putting those views in real conditions.

- **Reading Processing Model**

Reading processes have been categorized as data-driven processes in which reader should have sophisticated knowledge of language itself and conceptually-driven approach in which he draws on his intelligence and experience to understand a text (Brown, 2001).

According to Abbot (2007, p.15), “Some of the binary reading strategies include bottom-up vs. top-down, local vs. global, data driven vs. concept driven, form based vs. meaning based, syntactic vs. semantic, decoding vs. meaning getting, language-based vs. knowledge-based, word-level vs. text-level, micro vs. macro, analytic vs. synthetic, and analytic vs. global”.

- **Top-down Processing**

Top-down processing wants readers to administer the background knowledge before and during the reading process, through the existent clues in the text, in order to check if their previous knowledge was according to what they believed. (Eskey, 2005).

According to Nunan (2001) in top-down processing or psycholinguistic approach to reading, one begins with a series of hypotheses or predictions about the concept of the text one is about to read, and then selectively samples the text to determine whether or not one’s predictions are correct.

Nuttall (1998) compared top-down processing to an eagle eye’s view of the landscape in which an eagle was able to take a look at the expanded landscape from distant point of sky and this way it can have a general pattern between various parts of something that an observer on the ground cannot have

According to Birch(2007), “As we learn to decode, we also learn a large set of strategic reading skills, which we will call top-down skills and strategies, that readers use in concert with background knowledge to construct meaning from the text (p. 33).

Therefore, top-down processing model to reading is a process one begins with the largest elements and works down towards smaller elements to build comprehension of what is being read.

- **Personality Traits**

According to Chamorro-Premuzic (2007), traits represent implicit connection between noticeable behaviors and internal dispositions or preferences to act, these associations picture the individual’s unchanging patterns of behavior and delineate differences between rather than within individuals, this in turn may lead to various types of feelings, thinking, and behaving in different ways and among different people.

Personality can be defined in two different ways (a) a number of qualities characterizing an individual, or as (b) the subjacent system that brought on the set of attributes (Boyle, Mathews, & Saklofske, 2008).

Eysenck 1967 (cited in Singh, 2005, p. 126) “identifies the major component of personality as a small number of personality types. Each type includes a set of personality features. For instance, people who are considered as an extrovert according to Eysenck extroverted type are believed to have characteristics such as sociability, liveliness, and excitability.”

The studies have revealed that the most eye-catching personality dimension attracting and prompting researchers’ focus in the L2 field has always been extroversion/introversion (Dorneye, 2005).

- **Extroversion**

“Extroverted is the extent to which a person has a deep-seated need to receive ego enhancement, self-esteem, and a sense of wholeness from other people whereas introverted receives that affirmation within oneself” (Brown, 2000, p. 166).

“A person whose conscious interaction is more often directed towards other people and events than towards the person themselves” is considered an Extrovert (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, P. 195).

According to Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) which was administered in this research to rate extroversion/introversion position of the participants, extroverts are bored as time passes by and therefore

they need to be encouraged by the external causes to perform optimally outside of their context. Those whose scores will be 13 or more on the EPI will be considered extroverts.

• **Introversion**

“A person who tends to avoid social contact with others and is often preoccupied with his feelings, thoughts, and experience” is considered an introvert (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p. 195).

Introverts are more interested in activities such as reading, writing, and drawing than activities which require them to act in an outgoing way (Naik, 2010).

According to the Eysenck, introvert learners are anxious as time elapses and therefore they need calmness and do not want to be interfered by the others to perform optimally. Those whose scores will be 12 or less on the EPI will be considered introverts.

**3. Methodology**

This study dealt with one model of learning, namely top-down processing, in regards with its effect on reading comprehension of introvert and extrovert intermediate EFL learners. To conduct the research, a questionnaire of 57 questions called Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) was given to all participants. The design of the study was quasi-experimental posttest only as non-random assignment of two groups took place at the outset of each treatment phase. In order to clarify how the researcher found the answers to the research questions of this study, all that would be conducted throughout the process with detailed information on participants, instrumentation, treatment, were discussed in this part.

**Participants**

A cohort of one hundred fifty (n=150) Iranian EFL learners studying at Mehr Language School institute in Kerman formed the participants for this study. Nelson Reading Danny Test was administered to the participants in order to homogenize them based on their reading proficiency. Considering  $\pm 1$  standard deviation of the scores one hundred (n=100) language learners were selected for the study. In the next phase of the study, Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) was administered to the participants in order to identify their leaning styles, i.e., introversion and extroversion. Using the results of Eysenck personality inventory the participants were divided into four main groups namely; introvert experimental group, extrovert experimental group, introvert control group and extrovert control group. Twenty five (n=25) participants were assigned in each group.

**Table 1**  
**Participants' Descriptive Data**

Groups	N	Proficiency Level	Gender
Experimental/Introvert (Group1)	25	Intermediate	Male
Experimental/Extrovert (Group2)	25	Intermediate	Male
Control/Introvert (Group3)	25	Intermediate	Male
Control/ Extrovert (Group4)	25	Intermediate	Male

**Instrumentation**

**Nelson Denny Reading Test (NDRT)** is the other test, which will be used at second stage for the current study. NDRT have two parts to the exam: Vocabulary, and Reading Comprehension. The Vocabulary section has 80 multiple-choice questions, and test takers will choose from five possible answers on each one. For the Reading Comprehension section, the test taker will read five brief passages taken from high school and university textbooks, and then answer 38 multiple-choice questions testing both direct comprehension skills, and the ability to make inferences based on what they've read. The entire test takes about 45 minutes. This test will be used twice for the current study. The first time is to evaluate the reading comprehension of

the students. At the end of the study, after applying the treatment, the same test will be used as the posttest to make the researcher able to decide upon the presented hypotheses.

**Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI)** was designed by the German psychologist Hans Jurgen Eysenck and his wife Sybil B. G. Eysenck. Eysenck firstly pictured personality as two categories of biologically-based temperament which include: extroversion/introversion and neuroticism/stability. This hugely validated test consists of 57 Yes/No items. Those who fill out the EPI receive three different kinds of scores: the E score which is related to how much extrovert a person is, the N score measuring the neuroticism, and the Lie score which tries to measure how socially desirable a person has wanted to prove to be. The E score is computed out of 24 because it consists of 24 items, the N score is out of 24, and the Lie score is out of 9.

The Yes/No answers should be given based on the usual way of acting or thinking of an individual. The researcher used the Farsi version provided and validated by Noor institute of Behavioral Sciences Research in Tallish in order for the respondents to answer the questionnaire more accurately. The answer key and the standard rating scales will be also provided in the battery.

A researcher-made posttest consisting of 30 items was administered to the participants as the posttest. The test was piloted prior to the main study to make sure ratios of item facility and item discrimination were within the acceptable range. The reliability of the test was also gauged using Crombach Alpha formula.

### Procedure

The data gathered through the Nelson reading Danny Test was also used as the pretest scores and was compared to the participants' posttest scores in order to probe the answer to the reading questions. The treatment in both groups, however, took 10 session over the period of 3 weeks. Each session lasted for 45 minutes.

In the experimental groups, top-down reading strategy as explained by Brown (1989) were implemented. As top down reading requires understanding the gist of the text (Brown, 1989), the researcher asked the participants to read the texts and write a one-sentence marginal note as the main discussion of the paragraph. Having read the text in this manner, the participants were given a list of paragraph headings and were asked to relate each heading to the relevant paragraph. As for the control groups, the participants were asked to read the paragraphs and underline the specific information they found significant in each paragraph. After reading the paragraphs, they were given not only match-the-headings exercises, but also yes-no and rue-false-not given questions as end of text exercises. All participants in all groups took a thirty-item researcher-made test as the posttest.

## 4. Data Analysis

### Piloting Researcher-made Reading Test

Before the main study, the researcher-made reading test was piloted. Thirty students took the 30 item multiple-choice test and by assigning 1 point to correct answers and 0 to the wrong answers, the test was scored. Normality test was done to ensure about normal distribution of the

**Table 1**  
**Reliability Statistics, Pilot Test**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.79	30

$p = .05$

Next, the reliability of the test was checked based on Crombach's Alpha method. The test result on Table 1, ( $\alpha = 0.79$ ,  $p = 0.05$ ) proved that the test reliability was acceptable according to many scholars ( $\alpha > 0.7$ ) (Raza and Hanif, 2013; Ali & Raza, 2015; Raza et al., 2016).

**Table 2**  
**Test of Normality, All Tests**

	N	Skewness		Kurtosis	
		Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Pilot Test	30	-.715	.427	.166	.833
Nelson Reading Proficiency Test	150	.324	.198	-.326	.394
Group 1	25	.078	.464	-.337	.902
Nelson Reading Proficiency Test Group 2	25	.299	.464	-.688	.902
Group 3	25	.064	.464	-.935	.902
Group 4	25	.043	.464	-.945	.902
Reading Post Test Group 1	25	.401	.464	-.359	.902
Group 2	25	.317	.464	.110	.902
Group 3	25	.427	.464	-.198	.902
Group 4	25	.425	.464	.414	.902

scores as an assumption for reliability test. Considering Table 2 which shows the test of normality for different tests of the study, the ratios of skewness and kurtosis over their respective standard errors were within the acceptable range of +/-1, indicating the normal distribution of the all tests' data including the pilot test.

**Homogeneity Test**

Nelson reading proficiency test was administered to 150 language learners to homogenize them based on their reading proficiency level. Considering one standard deviation above and below the mean score on reading proficiency test and the results of Eysenck Personality Inventory questionnaire, one hundred (N = 100) participants were selected and distributed into two experimental and two control groups. To make sure that the all groups were homogenous in term of reading proficiency, the researcher used the t-test.

**Table 3**  
**Descriptive Statistics for Nelson Proficiency test**

	Personality trait	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
<b>Score</b>	Introverts	50	17.3478	1.19121	.24838
	Extroverts	50	17.5333	1.12932	.23052

**Table 4**  
**Independent Samples Test Nelson Proficiency Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
score		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
score	Equal variances assumed	.123	.727	.043	45	.966	.01449	.33848	-.66724	.69623
	Equal variances not assumed			.043	44.583	.966	.01449	.33887	-.66821	.69719

There was not any significant difference between the experimental and control groups on the Nelson proficiency test ( $F (.123) = .72, p > .05$  (Table 5). Thus it can be concluded that the experimental and control groups enjoyed the same level of general language proficiency prior to the main study.

**Main Study**

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics, Reading Post Test**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Group1 (Experimental/Introvert)	25	19.35	3.083	9.590
Group2 (Experimental/Extrovert)	25	18.87	2.975	7.857
Group3 (Control / Introvert)	25	16.48	2.786	6.677
Group4 (Control / Extrovert)	25	16.35	2.584	7.760

**Research Question 1**

In order to find the answer to research question 1, independent samples test was run to compare the score of the participants in the experimental groups and the control groups regardless of their learning style. Based on the results displayed in Table 5, it can be claimed that the experimental group ( $M = 19.11, SD = 2.81$ ) had a considerable higher mean than the control group ( $M = 16.41, SD = 2.75$ ).

**Table 6: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
								Lower	Upper
General	Equal variances assumed	.036	.850	.012	51	.012	2.695	.71216	-1.41276
	Equal variances not assumed			.012	44.621	.991	2.695	.70701	-1.41599

The results of the independent t-test ( $t (51) = .012, p = .991, r = .712$  representing a large effect size). As Table 5 indicates  $F=.036, p=.850$  the difference between the mean scores of the control group and experimental group is meaningful.

**Research Question 2**

The results of the independent t-test ( $t (68) = 3.89, p = .00, r = .688$  representing a large effect size) . Table 7 indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the introvert control group and introvert experimental group is meaningful. Thus, the second null hypothesis was rejected.

**Table 7: Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Interval Difference	Confidence of the Interval
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed.	.041	.841	13.892	68.000	.680	85688791.306	384.055	32	
	Equal variances not assumed	3.912	.444	37.000	68.000	.680	85688791.306	384.055	32	

**Research Question 3**

The results of t-test (Table 8) show that there is a significant effect between extrovert students' in experimental and control groups. So, the third null hypothesis was rejected.

**Table 8**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
<b>Score</b>	Equal variances assumed	.214	.645	-11.032	75	.000	-3.63333	.32934	-4.28942	-2.97725

**Research question 4**

**Table 9  
Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
<b>Introvert- extrovert posttest</b>	Equal variances assumed	.164	.688	.151	46	.881	.12500	.8287	-1.5431	1.79318
	Equal variances not assumed	1.514	.214	5.847	88.000	.023	.12500	.8287	-1.5433	1.79333

An independent samples t-test was run to find out if the difference between the introvert group's and extrovert group's is significant. As displayed in Table 9 ( $t(46)=.151$ ,  $p=.881$ ,  $r=.828$ ) indicating that there is a weak effect size and that the difference between the groups is not meaningful. Thus, the fourth hypothesis was rejected.

It should be mentioned that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met (Leven's  $F=.164$ ,  $P=.688$ ). The result revealed that there was no significant difference between learners mean in experimental groups.

## **5. Discussion**

### **The First Research Question was:**

RQ1. Does instruction of top-down reading strategies have any impact on reading comprehension of intermediate EFL learners?

The results of the independent t-test indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the control group and experimental group is meaningful. Thus the first null hypothesis as "The instruction of top down reading strategies does not have any impact on the reading comprehension of intermediate EFL learners" was rejected.

### **The Second Research Question was:**

RQ2. Does instruction of top-down reading strategies have any impact on reading comprehension of introvert intermediate EFL Learners?

The results of the independent t-test indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the introvert control group and introvert experimental group is meaningful.. Thus the second null hypothesis as "The instruction of top down reading strategies does not have any impact on the reading comprehension of introvert intermediate EFL learners." was rejected.

### **The Third Research Question was:**

RQ3. Does instruction of top-down reading strategies have any impact on reading comprehension of extrovert intermediate EFL learners?

The results of t-test (Table 8) shows that there is a significant effect between extrovert students' in experimental and control groups. Thus the third null hypothesis as "The instruction of top down reading strategies does not have any impact on the reading comprehension of extrovert intermediate EFL learners." was rejected.

### **The Forth Research Question was:**

RQ4. If the answers to questions 2 and 3 are yes: Which type of learners benefits more?

The results of t-test revealed that there was no significant difference between learners mean in experimental groups. Thus the forth hypothesis as "The instruction of top down reading strategies has more impact on the reading comprehension of extrovert learners than introvert intermediate EFL learners" was rejected.

This study was an attempt to explore the effects top-down reading strategies on extrovert/introvert EFL learners' reading comprehension. The results of data analysis revealed that the experimental and control groups were statistically different with respect to to-down strategies. But the difference between introvert/extrovert students performances in experimental and groups was not significant.

The results of the present research (based on Independent Sample T-test) showed that there was not a significant difference between the extrovert/ introvert groups on reading comprehension. Therefore, according to the results obtained from data extroversion does affect reading comprehension. It is in alignment with the studies of Scheibner-Herzig, Thiele, Jelinek and Kokoschka, 1984 who did not find any significant correlation between extroversion and the second language performance in English. However, it is

not in line with (Chastain, 1975; Keswer, 1987; Busch, 1982). It could be argued that the pedagogical practice of personality strategy did not promote their reading skill and focused learners' attention on the understanding of the texts.

## **6. Conclusion**

Alptekin (2006, p. 494) defined reading: "as an interaction of the reader's text-based and knowledge-based processes. In processing texts, readers combine literal comprehension, based on lower-level cognitive processes of reading such as lexical access and syntactic parsing, with inferential comprehension, based on higher-level cognitive processes such as the text base of comprehension (to understand what the text says) and the situation model of interpretation (to understand what it is about)". The goal of the current investigation was to determine if top-down reading strategies and personality activities affected the comprehension reading of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. The type of personality significantly had not any impact on reading proficiency of Iranian EFL learners.

The purpose of the current study was to examine the effects of comprehension reading activities on Iranian school intermediate learners' reading skills. Findings from this study indicated that resorting to pre-reading activities in a classroom had significant effect on the students' reading skills. Prior to the treatment, the independent-sample t-test was administered to find out any significant difference in pre-test mean scores between students in both groups. The findings revealed that both groups were equal in their performances at the beginning of the course. After the treatment, the independent sample t-test was done to find out any significant difference in reading post-test mean scores between students in both groups. The findings indicated that students in extroverted and introverted groups did not show significant improvement in their reading Compared with each other. The findings of this study will be highly invaluable for teacher, material developers and instructors to consider the usefulness of extroversion and introversion activities, and invest more in designing and applying such materials. However, the present thesis focused on working extroversion and introversion activities task treatment which can be useful effective in boosting Iranian learners' comprehension level. More clearly speaking, the results showed that there was a significant difference between the scores of the participants on traditional approach and their scores on the other approach. There was a positive impact of the method on students' vocabulary components of reading. That is, extroversion and introversion tasks strategy instruction cannot significantly influence intermediate EFL learners' reading proficiency. The results of Independent Samples *t*-test analysis showed that there was not a significant difference between the mean score of extroverted group and mean score of introverted group. The descriptive statistics also showed that the mean scores of the extroverted group were not differ of introverted group but basically top-down reading strategies had significantly effect on reading comprehension intermediate EFL learners.

## **References**

- Abbot, G. (2007). *The teaching of English as an international language*. Glasgow and London: Collins.
- Ajideh, P. (2003). Schemata theory-based pre-reading tasks: A neglected essential in the ESL reading class. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(1).
- Ali, M., & Raza, S. A. (2015). Service quality perception and customer satisfaction in Islamic banks of Pakistan: the modified SERVQUAL model. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 1-19. DOI 10.1080/14783363.2015.1100517
- Barnett, M. A. (2007). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. London: Cambridge University.
- Birch, B. M. (2007). *English second language reading*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Boyle, G. J., Mathews, G., & Saklofske, D. H. (2008). *The sage handbook of personality theory and assessment*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. San Francisco: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Francisco: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Brown, J. D. (1989). Language program evaluation: A synthesis of existing possibilities. *The second language curriculum*, 222-241.
- Busch, D. (1982). Introversion-extroversion and the EFL proficiency of Japanese students.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second of foreign language*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chamorro-Premuzik, T. (2007). *Personality and individual differences*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chastain, K. (1975). Affective and ability factors in second language acquisition. *Language*
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159.
- Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner. Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language teaching*. Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University Press.
- Eskey, D. E. (2005). *Interactive models for second language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Farstrup, S. (2002). *What research has to say about reading instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Gebhard, J. G. (2009). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Gladwin, F. R., & Stepp-Greeny, J. (2008). An interactive, instructor supported reading approach vs. traditional reading instruction in Spanish. *Foreign language annals*, 41(4)
- Grabe, W. (2004). Research on teaching reading. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 24, 44-69.
- Hadley, A. O. (2003). *Teaching language in context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle
- Harmer, J. (2008). *How to teach English*. USA: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Hedge, T. (2008). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- language achievements and personality variables in 15-years-old pupils. *TTL Review of Language Learning*, 32(1), 109-132.
- Learning, 25(1), 153-161.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. NJ: LEA.
- McNeil, J. D. (1992). *Reading comprehension: New directions for classroom practice*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California.
- Naik, A. (2010). *Introvert personality*. Retrieved on July 10, 2010, from: [WWW.buzzle.com/articles/introvert-personality.html](http://WWW.buzzle.com/articles/introvert-personality.html).
- Nunan, D. (2001). *Second Language teaching and learning*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong
- Nuttal, C. (1998). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Oxford: McMillan.
- Raza, S. A., Qazi, W., & Umer, A. (2016). Facebook Is a Source of Social Capital Building Among University Students Evidence From a Developing Country. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 1-28, DOI: 10.1177/0735633116667357.

- Raza, S. A., & Hanif, N. (2013). Factors affecting internet banking adoption among internal and external customers: a case of Pakistan. *International Journal of Electronic Finance*, 7(1), 82-96.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge:
- Scheibner-Herzig, G., Thiele, A., Jelinek, G. & Kokoschka, S. (1984). *A study of foreign Thornbury, S. (2006). An a to z of language teaching*. USA: Macmillian
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yazar, U. (2013). Teaching Reading to EFL Students to Make Them Better Readers. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 3(3), 35-48.