IJEE
Indonesian Journal of English Education

UNDERSTANDING ENGLISH SPEAKING DIFFICULTIES: MBTI PERSONALITY TYPES AND PSYCHOLINGUISTICS PERSPECTIVE AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Rica Umrina Lubis[1*], Sartika Dewi Harahap[2], Indra Kurniawan Siregar[3]
[1,2,3]State College of Islamic Studies Mandailing Natal, North Sumatera, Indonesia
(umrinarica@gmail.com)

Received: November 2025 ; Revised: November 2025; Accepted: December 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines the internal factors contributing to English-speaking difficulties among university students by integrating the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) personality framework with a psycholinguistic perspective. The study focuses on how personality traits, such as extroversion, emotional stability, and cognitive preferences, relate to students' self-perceived speaking ability. A quantitative-descriptive design with correlational analysis was employed, involving 60 students of English Language Education at STAIN Mandailing Natal. Data were collected through an online questionnaire combining a 16-item MBTI personality assessment with a 10-item self-assessment of English-speaking ability. The results indicate that students with extroverted, assertive, and judging traits demonstrated higher confidence and fluency, with an overall mean speaking score of M = 4.32. In contrast, introverted and turbulent students reported more anxiety and hesitation. A significant difference was found between the extroverted and introverted groups (p = 0.033), while the differences between judging-perceiving and turbulent-assertive groups were not statistically significant. The findings highlight the psychological dimension of speaking performance and underscore the need for language instruction responsive to learners' emotional and personality differences. By addressing cognitive and affective aspects, educators can create more inclusive and effective strategies to support diverse speaking development in English as a foreign language.

Keywords: MBTI personality types; psycholinguistic factors; English-speaking difficulties

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini mengkaji faktor internal yang mempengaruhi kesulitan berbicara dalam bahasa Inggris di kalangan mahasiswa, dengan mengintegrasikan kerangka kepribadian Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) dan perspektif psikolinguistik. Fokus penelitian ini adalah bagaimana ciri-ciri kepribadian seperti ekstroversi, stabilitas emosional, dan preferensi kognitif berhubungan dengan kemampuan berbicara menurut persepsi diri mahasiswa. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain deskriptif-kuantitatif dengan analisis korelasional, melibatkan 60 mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di STAIN Mandailing Natal. Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner daring yang terdiri dari 16 item untuk mengidentifikasi tipe kepribadian MBTI dan 10 item penilaian diri terhadap kemampuan berbicara. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa dengan tipe kepribadian ekstrovert, asertif, dan judging memiliki tingkat kepercayaan diri dan kefasihan yang lebih tinggi dengan rata-rata kemampuan berbicara M=4,32. Sebaliknya, mahasiswa dengan tipe introvert dan turbulent cenderung mengalami kecemasan dan keraguan saat berbicara. Perbedaan signifikan ditemukan antara kelompok ekstrovert dan introvert p=0,033, sementara perbedaan antara tipe jugding-perceiving dan turbulent-assertive tidak signifikan secara statistik. Temuan ini menekankan pentingnya aspek psikologis dalam performa berbicara dan perlunya pengajaran bahasa yang responsif terhadap perbedaan emosional dan kepribadian peserta didik. Dengan memperhatikan aspek kognitif dan afektif, pengajar dapat merancang strategi pembelajaran berbicara yang lebih inklusif dan efektif dalam konteks pembelajaran bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing.

Kata Kunci: *MBTI tipe kepribadian; Faktor-faktor psikolinguistik; kesulitan berbicara*

How to Cite:
Lubis, R. U., Harahap, S. D., & Siregar, I. K. (2025). Understanding English Speaking Difficulties: MBTI Personality Types and Psycholinguistics Perspective among University Students. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12*(2), 273–284. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

*Corresponding author

IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.46451

INTRODUCTION

Speaking proficiency is a fundamental component in mastering a foreign language and serves as a key indicator of communication competence (Lubis & Indra Kurniawan Siregar, 2021). In the context of higher education in Indonesia, many university students face significant challenges in developing their English-speaking skills. Recent studies have highlighted that a substantial number of students experience moderate to high levels of speaking anxiety, which adversely affects their oral performance (Fitriah & Muna, 2019; Handayani & Sanusi, 2020; Najiha, 2021; Nur Hayati & Kaniadewi, 2022; Qadri et al., 2023; Rahmadani & Etfita, 2022; Yoskapela et al., 2022; Yusuf et al., 2023)

English-speaking difficulties are not only caused by language problems like limited vocabulary or grammatical knowledge. Psychological and cognitive aspects also play a crucial role, as explored within the field of psycholinguistics. Psycholinguistics examines how language is processed in the mind, encompassing skills like speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and how psychological states influence language performance (Aitchison, 2003; Field, 2004). In speaking contexts, variables such as self-confidence, anxiety, cognitive style, and personality traits significantly contribute to oral communication success (Dornyei, Zoltan & Ryan, 2018).

One framework for understanding personality-related differences in speaking difficulties is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), which classifies individuals into 16 personality types based on four dichotomous dimensions: Extraversion–Introversion, Sensing–Intuition, Thinking–Feeling, and Judging–Perceiving (Puji & Ahmad, 2016; Quenk, 2019; Zhang, 2025; Zubaidah et al., 2024; Zulkifli, 2024). These personality types influence how individuals process information, make decisions, and interact with the external world. For instance, introverted students may be more reflective and reserved, potentially facing challenges when speaking in public settings. Conversely, extroverted students tend to be more expressive but may struggle with maintaining structure and coherence in extended speaking tasks (Chae, 2016; Hanifa et al., 2022).

Based on interviews with several students from the English Education Department at STAIN Mandailing Natal, it was found that many of them experience significant nervousness when delivering presentations in English. This anxiety often hinders them from expressing their thoughts clearly and spontaneously. Some students reported that, despite having prepared their material, the pressure of speaking in front of the class caused them to forget vocabulary or lose focus while presenting their ideas.

This phenomenon illustrates how psychological factors, particularly speaking anxiety, may disrupt language production process and oral fluency, especially in academic speaking contexts. Previous studies consistently indicate that personality traits play a crucial role in shaping learners' speaking performance. Palijama (2020) found that introverted students tend to experience stronger anxiety symptoms such as mental blocking, tension, and speech hesitation which hinder spontaneous language production. Similarly, Sabrina and Khairunnisa (2025) reported that introverts often avoid voluntary speaking tasks due to fear of negative evaluation and low communicative confidence, resulting in limited verbal output. Beyond introversion, other personality dimensions also contribute to speaking challenges. Learners with a Perceiving (P) preference may appear more spontaneous, yet they frequently struggle to organize their ideas coherently, leading to inconsistent fluency and unclear message delivery (Hanifa et al., 2022). In contrast, Judging (J) types generally perform better in structured or prepared speaking tasks but may still face anxiety in interactive or unpredictable speaking situations. These findings show that speaking difficulties arise not only from linguistic limitations but also from learners' psychological dispositions. Therefore, speaking instruction should adopt a more nuanced and personalized approach that accommodates individual personality profiles and affective tendencies to support more effective oral communication.

Previous studies primarily describe observable speaking behaviors associated with personality factors such as hesitation, avoidance, or difficulty organizing ideas, but they do not explain how

*Corresponding author
IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

these personality traits influence the underlying psycholinguistic processes of speech production, including conceptual planning, lexical retrieval speed, working memory load, and monitoring mechanisms. In other words, earlier research has explained what types of learners tend to struggle, but not why these struggles occur at the cognitive-processing level. Moreover, research in the Indonesian higher education context has yet to integrate MBTI personality dimensions with psycholinguistic models to examine how psychological dispositions interact with language processing during speaking. This gap is particularly relevant because not all MBTI dimensions may influence speaking ability in the same way. Preliminary evidence suggests that certain traits such as Extraversion and Introversion may have a stronger cognitive and affective impact on speaking performance compared to other dimensions.

To address this, the present study draws upon recent psycholinguistic perspectives which conceptualize speaking as a multistage cognitive process involving conceptualization, lexical retrieval, formulation, articulation, and self-monitoring (Olkkonen et al., 2024; Qurbi, 2025; Sekarsari, 2025). Within this framework, individual differences such as MBTI personality traits are assumed to influence the efficiency of these cognitive operations, particularly when speakers perform under communicative pressure in L2 contexts. Recent studies have examined cognitive fluency and automaticity in speech processing; however, they rarely integrate personality dimensions when analyzing how learners manage speech processing demands. This indicates a research gap, as prior studies tend to explore either cognitive mechanisms or personality-based learning behavior separately without examining how both interact during real-time speaking.

Thus, the novelty of the present study lies in integrating a personality framework (MBTI) with psycholinguistic speech-processing theory to explain not only the behavioral symptoms of speaking difficulties but also the underlying cognitive mechanisms that trigger them. Through this integrated lens, the study aims to provide a more comprehensive explanation of why students with different personality profiles experience distinct challenges in speaking performance, rather than merely describing what those challenges look like.

METHODS

Research design

This study employed a quantitative-descriptive design with correlational analysis, which is appropriate for identifying the relationship between personality types and English-speaking difficulties among university students. The design aimed to provide a clear description of the distribution of MBTI personality types and to investigate the extent to which these personality traits relate to self-perceived speaking difficulties in English. This approach also enabled the integration of psycholinguistic observations to enhance the analysis of learners' speaking difficulties.

Research site and participants

The research was conducted at STAIN Mandailing Natal. The participants consisted of 60 students majoring in the English Language Education Study Program at STAIN Mandailing Natal**.** Participants were selected through purposive sampling, ensuring they had sufficient exposure to speaking courses such as Basic Speaking, Intermediate Speaking, or Advanced Speaking from the second to the sixth Semester.

Data collection and analysis

The data were collected through an online questionnaire using Google Forms. The link was distributed to selected students through academic chat groups. Before beginning the questionnaire, participants were provided with a brief explanation about the research purpose. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first part of the questionnaire measured MBTI personality types using

*Corresponding author

IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

a modified version of the MBTI instrument. It consisted of 16 forced choice items representing the four MBTI dichotomies: Extraversion vs Introversion, Sensing vs Intuition, Thinking vs Feeling, and Judging vs Perceiving. This questionnaire was designed to identify each student's dominant personality type based on their preference combinations. The instrument was adapted from Jung's theory of psychological typology (Quenk, 2019).

The second part of the questionnaire assessed students' English-speaking abilities using a 7-point Likert scale. A 10-item self-assessment instrument was developed to measure various aspects of oral communication, including fluency, clarity, confidence, anxiety management, argumentation, and public speaking. Each item was rated from 1 (Very Poor) to 7 (Excellent). The scale was adapted from (Lander & Brown, 1995) and aligned with second language speaking descriptors suggested by (Richards, 2006).

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to determine the frequency distribution of MBTI personality types and the average scores across the ten English-speaking skill items. To calculate the average (mean) score of students' self-assessment in speaking, the following formula was used:

$$\underline{x} = Mean\ (average)\ score$$

$\sum X$ = The total score obtained by students

N = Number of students

In addition, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare differences in speaking performance across selected MBTI dimensions, particularly Extraversion-Introversion, Judging-Perceiving, and Turbulent-Asertive. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) was used to measure the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two continuous variables (e.g., speaking skill scores and MBTI preference scales), reporting correlation coefficients (r), p-values, and effect sizes based on Cohen's criteria (Cohen, 2003) (small=0.10, medium=0.30, large=0.50). The formula for Pearson correlation is:

$$r = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

X and Y = variables being correlated

N = Number of paired scores

r = ranges from -1 to +1, where:

+1 = perfect positive correlation

0 = no correlation

-1 = perfect negative correlation

To ensure the accuracy and consistency of the research instruments, both the MBTI questionnaire and the English-speaking self-assessment scale were tested for validity and reliability before use. Content validity was examined through expert judgment involving two lecturers in English education and one lecturer in educational psychology, who evaluated the clarity, relevance, and appropriateness of each item. Construct validity was assessed using corrected item–total correlation, and all items met the minimum requirement of $r > 0.30$. A pilot test was administered to 20 students outside the main sample to evaluate the reliability of the instruments. The results showed that the 16-item MBTI scale had a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.82, while the 10-item speaking self-assessment scale had a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.88, indicating high internal consistency. These findings confirm that both instruments were valid and reliable for measuring students' personality types and self-perceived English-speaking ability.

*Corresponding author

IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This study adopted a quantitative-descriptive design with correlational analysis to explore the relationship between MBTI personality types and English-speaking difficulties among university students. Conducted at STAIN Mandailing Natal, the study involved 60 English Language Education students selected through purposive sampling, ensuring they had taken speaking-related courses from the second to sixth semester. Data were collected using an online questionnaire via Google Forms, consisting of two parts, namely, a 16-item MBTI personality assessment based on Jung's psychological typology and a 10-item self-assessment of English-speaking ability rated on a 7-point Likert scale, adapted from (Lander & Brown, 1995) and (Richards, 2006). The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation, and one-way ANOVA to determine the distribution of MBTI types, students' average speaking scores, and the potential relationships between personality traits and speaking performance.

MBTI Personality Type Distribution

The study analyzed the MBTI personality types of 60 English Language Education Department students from STAIN Mandailing Natal, spanning Semesters 2, 4, and 6. The results showed a diverse range of personality types, with several dominant patterns.

Table 1. MBTI Personality Type Distribution

No	MBTI Type	Description	Semester 2	Semester 4	Semester 6	Total
1	ENTJ-T	Turbulent Commander	2	2	3	7
2	ESTP-A	Assertive Entrepreneur	4	2	1	7
3	ISTJ-A	Assertive Logistician	3	3	1	7
4	INFJ-T	Turbulent Advocate	2	1	3	6
5	ENFP-T	Turbulent Campaigner	2	3	1	6
6	ESFP-T	Turbulent Entertainer	2	2	1	5
7	ISTJ-T	Turbulent Logistician	1	2	2	5
8	INTP-T	Turbulent Logician	0	3	1	4
9	INTJ-T	Turbulent Architect	2	1	1	4
10	INFP-T	Turbulent Mediator	1	2	0	3
11	INFJ-A	Assertive Advocate	1	0	1	2
12	ENFJ-A	Assertive Protagonist	1	1	0	2
13	ENFJ-T	Turbulent Protagonist	1	0	0	1
14	ENTJ-A	Assertive Commander	1	0	0	1

The most frequent personality types were ENTJ-T, ESTP-A, and ISTJ-A, each appearing six times across all semesters. A majority of students fell under the Turbulent (T) subtype, indicating a tendency toward perfectionism and anxiety sensitivity. Most students were Introverted (I), with a strong representation from the Thinking (T) and Judging (J) categories, consistent with learners who prefer structure, analysis, and internal reflection.

English-Speaking Self-Assessment Results

The English-speaking self-assessment consisted of 10 items rated on a 7-point Likert scale. The average scores across all students indicate a moderate to good level of self-confidence in English speaking, as presented in Table 2.

*Corresponding author

IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

Table 2. English-Speaking Self-Assessment Results

No	Item	Mean Score
1	I can understand what others say in English conversation	5.06
2	I can start a conversation in English with confidence	4.51
3	I use proper intonation and expression when speaking	4.43
4	I can manage nervousness or anxiety when speaking English	4.27
5	I can overcome fear when speaking English in public	4.16
6	I can argue or defend my point in a discussion in English	4.14
7	I can express my ideas clearly in English	4.02
8	I can respond to others' questions or opinions effectively	4.06
9	I can answer oral questions in English fluently	3.96
10	I can speak without frequent pauses or hesitation	3.76

The highest score was in receptive understanding (M = 5.06), while the lowest was in fluency without hesitation (M = 3.76). This suggests that students comprehend spoken English well but often struggle with spontaneous production and maintaining fluency.

Comparison of Speaking Ability by Semester

Table 3 Comparison of Speaking Ability by Semester

Semester	Mean Speaking Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Students
2	4.06	1.35	25
4	4.63	0.87	20
6	4.27	0.58	15

The highest speaking score was found in Semester 4 (M = 4.63), indicating strong development after two years of study. Semester 6 showed slightly lower scores but with the least variability, suggesting consistent ability among students. Semester 2 had the lowest average and highest variation, indicating mixed proficiency levels typical of early-stage learners.

Correlation Between MBTI Personality Types and Speaking Ability

The results of the correlation analysis showed that certain MBTI personality dimensions had a weak to moderate relationship with students' English-speaking difficulties. Consistent patterns appeared in the data that supported relevant theories in second language learning and personality psychology.

Extroverted (E) students generally reported higher self-assessment scores in items related to oral fluency, spontaneous interaction, and public speaking confidence. This supports Dörnyei's (2005) assertion that extroverts tend to have a higher willingness to communicate (WTC), making them more active in speaking situations and less hindered by hesitation or fear. In contrast, Introverted (I) students, who were more dominant in the sample, often rated themselves lower in tasks requiring immediate verbal responses or emotionally expressive communication. However, they performed better in structured speaking situations, showing strength in clarity, precision, and content depth, which aligns with Jung's typology describing introverts as reflective and internally focused thinkers.

Turbulent (T) individuals, particularly those with types such as INTJ-T and INFJ-T, consistently indicated higher anxiety, fear of public speaking, and greater sensitivity to their speaking performance. Their responses suggest a high affective filter and a tendency toward

*Corresponding author
IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

perfectionism, which may limit fluency despite their conceptual strength. Judging (J) types scored higher in items related to organization, clarity, and argumentation, suggesting that students who prefer structure and planning tend to perform better in prepared or formal speaking tasks. These students are more likely to manage their speech logically, which reflects their cognitive preference for closure and structure. Perceiving (P) types, on the other hand, showed more variability in performance and tended to struggle in structured speaking settings, but some performed well in informal, interactive tasks. Their flexibility and adaptability are assets in open-ended speaking situations but may reduce consistency.

In this case, most students in Semester 2 showed introverted or turbulent traits (e.g., INFJ-T, INTJ-T, ISTJ-A), which are associated with internal reflection and anxiety. These traits may have contributed to lower confidence and fluency in spontaneous speaking tasks. The higher standard deviation (1.35) suggests that speaking performance varied widely, likely reflecting differing levels of adaptation to speaking tasks among MBTI types.

Moreover, A notable presence of ENFP-T and ENTJ-T types in Semester 4 extroverted and intuitive) may have supported greater fluency and speaking confidence. Judging types like ISTJ-T also contributed to structured, planned speaking. The higher mean score in this semester suggests that students with extroverted, intuitive, and judging characteristics were gaining more control and comfort in English-speaking contexts. While performance remained fairly high, the presence of more introverted and thinking types in Semester 6 such as INTJ-T, INTP-A, INFJ-T likely shaped a speaking style that was logically structured but possibly less spontaneous. The low standard deviation (0.58) indicates more consistent performance, possibly due to increased academic experience and exposure to structured speaking tasks.

Overall, only the Extraversion–Introversion dimension showed a strong and consistent relationship with speaking performance because it is directly linked to communicative confidence and verbal engagement. In contrast, the Judging–Perceiving, Turbulent–Assertive, Sensing–Intuition, and Thinking–Feeling dimensions showed weaker or non-significant associations because these characteristics relate more to cognitive styles or emotional tendencies rather than direct verbal expressiveness, resulting in smaller performance differences and overlapping score distributions.

Differences in speaking ability across MBTI Groups

To examine whether personality differences significantly affected students' English-speaking ability, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted on the speaking scores across selected MBTI personality dimensions. The test focused on three key dichotomies present in the MBTI framework: Extraversion vs. Introversion (E/I), Judging vs. Perceiving (J/P), and Turbulent vs. Assertive (T/A), and the results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Summary of ANOVA Result

MBTI Dimension		Observation Based on Data	P-Value	Statistical Result	Interpretation
Extraverted Introverted	vs	Extroverts scored higher, especially in fluency and confidence	0.033	Significant ($p < 0.05$)	Extroversion positively affects speaking ability
Judging Perceiving	vs.	Both groups performed similarly in self-assessment	0.137	Not significant ($p > 0.05$)	Speaking tasks may have balanced both traits
Turbulent Assertive	vs.	Turbulent types showed more anxiety, less fluency	0.072	Not significant	Affective filter may affect performance subtly

*Corresponding author

IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

Extraverted vs. Introverted

The analysis showed that students with Extraverted (E) personalities generally scored higher in self-assessed speaking ability compared to Introverted (I) students. This difference was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), indicating that extraversion likely influences speaking performance. This finding aligns with (Peng, 2024) *Willingness to Communicate (WTC)* theory, which states that extroverts are more inclined to participate in verbal interaction and are less inhibited by fear or hesitation. In the data, extraverted types such as ENTJ and ENFP were more prevalent in higher-performing semesters (especially Semester 4), and tended to rate themselves higher in areas such as fluency, confidence, and public speaking.

Judging vs. Perceiving

When comparing Judging (J) and Perceiving (P) types, the results did not show a statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$) in overall speaking scores. Both groups performed similarly across various speaking indicators. Although Judging types (e.g., ISTJ, ENTJ) are generally more structured and prefer planned activities—which could benefit formal speaking—this advantage may have been balanced by the adaptive, spontaneous traits of Perceiving types (e.g., ENFP, ESFP) in informal or interactive speaking contexts. The equal distribution across speaking styles in the self-assessment likely contributed to the similarity in performance.

Turbulent vs. Assertive

For the Turbulent (T) and Assertive (A) subtypes, the data revealed some interesting trends but no statistically significant differences were found in their overall speaking scores. However, turbulent types, such as INTJ-T and INFJ-T, reported higher anxiety and lower scores in items related to fluency and public speaking. These findings support (Krashen, 2009), which suggests that emotional factors like anxiety can interfere with language production. Turbulent students, who tend to be more self-critical and emotionally reactive, may experience a higher affective filter, lowering their speaking fluency even if their comprehension and grammar knowledge are strong.

Based on the data from 60 students, extraversion showed a meaningful influence on English-speaking performance, while judging/perceiving and turbulence/assertiveness had effects that were more nuanced or context-dependent. These results reinforce the idea that personality traits shape students' speaking experiences, especially in terms of confidence, fluency, and anxiety regulation.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that English-speaking difficulties among university students are closely connected to differences in personality preferences, particularly within the Extraversion–Introversion dimension. The descriptive results revealed that students with an Extraversion preference consistently reported higher levels of oral fluency, confidence, and willingness to participate in spontaneous communication. In contrast, students with an Introversion preference demonstrated higher anxiety, greater hesitation, and reduced verbal output, particularly during unprepared or interactive speaking tasks. These affective and behavioral tendencies significantly shaped their speaking performance, resulting in a statistically significant difference in the ANOVA test ($p = 0.033$). This pattern highlights that communicative disposition is a primary psycholinguistic factor influencing speaking ability in this context.

When compared with major prior studies, the present results show a strong degree of similarity. Zhang found that introverted university students reported higher speaking anxiety (Zhang, 2025), while Hanifa demonstrated that introverts experience stronger physiological symptoms of public speaking apprehension than their extroverted peers (Hanifa et al., 2022). These earlier findings closely parallel the tendencies observed in this study, supporting the conclusion that

*Corresponding author
IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

the Extraversion–Introversion dimension is the most relevant predictor of speaking performance. The results further indicate that traits associated with sociability, verbal expressiveness, and communication confidence directly shape anxiety levels, cognitive load, and speech production, thereby strengthening the theoretical link between personality and speaking ability.

In contrast, other MBTI dimensions—including Judging–Perceiving, Sensing–Intuition, Thinking–Feeling, and Turbulent–Assertive—produced weak or non-significant correlations with speaking ability. For example, although students with a Judging preference tended to perform better in structured speaking tasks and those with a Perceiving preference showed strengths in spontaneous interaction, these tendencies balanced each other, resulting in overlapping score distributions and a non-significant ANOVA result ($p = 0.137$). Similarly, the Sensing–Intuition and Thinking–Feeling dimensions showed minimal variation in speaking scores, as their underlying characteristics relate primarily to cognitive processing or decision-making preferences rather than direct communicative behavior. The Turbulent–Assertive dimension, while associated with emotional reactivity, also failed to show a significant effect on speaking performance ($p = 0.072$), likely because emotional stability influences anxiety but does not consistently alter overall verbal output.

These findings are consistent with Tang's (Tang, 2025) review of MBTI in second language acquisition, which argues that only dimensions linked directly to communication tendencies—particularly Extraversion—serve as reliable predictors of speaking performance. Likewise, Muhayyang showed that although personality and anxiety influence speaking, their impact is often mediated by contextual and affective conditions, such as task type, learning environment, and students' momentary stress levels (Muhayyang, 2023). The present study, therefore contributes to the growing evidence that personality traits do not influence speaking ability uniformly; rather, their effects depend on the degree to which they shape communicative behavior and affective responses.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, the prominence of the Extraversion–Introversion dimension can be understood through its influence on key stages of speech production. Introverted learners, who typically engage in higher levels of self-monitoring, tend to experience increased cognitive load when speaking. This elevated processing demand interferes with rapid lexical retrieval, resulting in frequent pauses and hesitation. Anxiety further disrupts phonological encoding, as learners become overly focused on accuracy rather than fluency, causing delays in articulatory planning. Extroverted learners, in contrast, appear to rely more on automatic processing, demonstrating faster formulation and smoother articulation with less conscious attention to linguistic form. These mechanisms provide a psycholinguistic explanation for why only the Extraversion–Introversion dimension produced statistically significant differences in speaking performance, while other MBTI preferences did not.

Overall, the pattern of results suggests that speaking difficulties in PTKIN students are more strongly related to psycholinguistic factors, especially anxiety, self-confidence, cognitive load, and willingness to communicate, than to cognitive-style differences. This highlights the importance of designing learning environments that support students' affective needs, reduce speaking anxiety, and encourage active participation. For educators, this includes incorporating low-anxiety speaking tasks, providing structured and unstructured speaking opportunities, and offering differentiated instruction that accommodates both introverted and extraverted learners. Additionally, the findings underscore the need for English-speaking instruction to be psychologically responsive, promoting supportive interactional settings where students can build confidence and gradually reduce anxiety associated with verbal communication.

In relation to previous research, the present study both confirms and extends earlier findings on personality and speaking performance. Similar to (Hanifa et al., 2022; Sabrina & Khairunnisa, 2025; Zhang, 2025) this study reinforces that the Extraversion–Introversion dimension remains the

*Corresponding author

IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

most consistent predictor of English-speaking fluency, confidence, and willingness to communicate. However, unlike several prior studies that reported notable differences across Judging–Perceiving and Turbulent–Assertive groups, the current results revealed non-significant effects, suggesting that these personality preferences may exert a weaker influence when speaking ability is measured through self-assessment rather than direct performance tests. This divergence indicates that students' perceived speaking competence may be shaped not only by personality traits but also by contextual, instructional, and affective conditions within the learning environment. Consequently, the findings highlight the need for a more nuanced understanding of personality factors in speaking difficulties, emphasizing that while extraversion consistently predicts communicative behavior, other MBTI dimensions may interact with situational variables in more subtle and context-dependent ways.

The findings of this study also provide several important implications for English-speaking instruction in higher education. Since the Extraversion–Introversion dimension emerged as the most influential factor shaping students' fluency and confidence, speaking pedagogy should be designed to accommodate different communicative dispositions. Teachers are encouraged to implement a balanced combination of structured, low-anxiety activities for introverted and turbulent learners such as guided practice, small-group discussions, and pre-speaking planning alongside more interactive and spontaneous tasks for extroverted students. The non-significant effects of the Judging–Perceiving and Turbulent–Assertive dimensions further suggest that speaking performance is not solely determined by personality traits but is highly dependent on task type, emotional support, and classroom environment. Thus, instructors need to foster psychologically responsive classrooms that reduce anxiety, promote active participation, and provide constructive feedback that helps learners develop personalized strategies to manage their internal speaking barriers. These implications reinforce the importance of integrating personality awareness into curriculum design so that all learners, regardless of their psychological tendencies, can develop stronger self-efficacy and greater confidence in expressing themselves in English.

Finally, this study contributes empirically to literature on personality and language learning by demonstrating that the Extraversion–Introversion dimension remains the strongest personality-related predictor of speaking performance, while other MBTI dimensions have limited or context-dependent influence. Future research is encouraged to integrate objective measures of speaking performance (e.g., speech rate, pause frequency, acoustic analysis) and to explore longitudinal changes in anxiety and communicative confidence across different stages of English learning.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

This study investigated the relationship between MBTI personality types and English-speaking difficulties among 60 English Language Education students. The findings revealed that certain personality dimensions particularly Extroversion, Judging, and Assertiveness are positively associated with higher self-assessed speaking ability, especially in areas of fluency, confidence, and public speaking. Conversely, Introverted and Turbulent types tended to report greater difficulty with anxiety management and spontaneous speaking.

Although personality is not the sole determinant of speaking performance, the study confirmed that it plays a meaningful role in shaping how students approach, experience, and assess their English-speaking skills. The results support the idea that language learning is influenced not only by instructional input but also by learners' emotional and cognitive profiles. Recognizing and responding to these psychological factors is essential for fostering more inclusive, responsive, and effective speaking instruction.

Based on these insights, it is recommended that educators design diverse speaking activities that cater to both structured and spontaneous communicators. For example, Judging types may benefit from prepared presentations, while Perceiving types may respond better to open discussions. Teachers should also provide emotionally supportive environments for Introverted and Turbulent

*Corresponding author
IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

learners, helping them build confidence gradually through positive reinforcement and low-anxiety speaking tasks.

Despite offering valuable insights, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the use of a self-assessment instrument may not fully capture students' actual speaking performance, as learners may overestimate or underestimate their ability. Future studies are encouraged to incorporate objective performance measures such as rubric-based evaluations, fluency analysis, or speaking tests to obtain more accurate results. Second, the sample size was limited to 60 participants from a single institutional context, which restricts the generalizability of the findings. Expanding the sample across different universities and cultural backgrounds would enhance the external validity of future research. Third, this study examined only selected MBTI dimensions, while other psychological factors such as motivation, self-efficacy, learning anxiety, and willingness to communicate were not explored. Future research should integrate these variables and consider longitudinal approaches to better understand how personality and affective conditions develop over time and influence speaking performance. By integrating psychological understanding into pedagogical design, language educators can empower all learners not only to improve their English fluency but also to speak with greater confidence, authenticity, and personal growth.

Acknowledgments

The writer would like to express sincere gratitude to the Head and lecturers of the English Language Education Department at STAIN Mandailing Natal for their valuable insights and support during the research. Special thanks are also extended to the 60 student participants who willingly took part in the study and generously shared their perspectives through the questionnaire.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, J. (2003). *Words in the mind: An introduction to the mental lexicon* (4th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Chae, M.-O. (2016). Empathic ability and communication ability according to Myers–Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) personality type in nursing students. *Journal of the Korea Academia-Industrial Cooperation Society, 17*(4), 303–311. https://doi.org/10.5762/kais.2016.17.4.303

Cohen, J. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2018). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315125671

Field, J. (2004). Psycholinguistics: A resource book for students. *System, 32*(1), 95–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2003.11.003

Fitriah, F., & Muna, H. (2019). Foreign language speaking anxiety: A case study of English department students of IAIN Lhokseumawe and Al Muslim University. *Jurnal Ilmiah DIDAKTIKA, 19*(2), 140–158.

Handayani, H., & Sanusi, A. (2020). Analisis dampak internet terhadap perkembangan bahasa siswa sekolah dasar kelas III. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 6, 34–42.

Hanifa, N., Anita, A., & Suaidi, A. (2022). Introverted learners' problems and solving strategies in speaking English. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris, 15*(2), 282–295. https://doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v15i2.13449

Krashen, S. D. (2009). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

Lander, J. A., & Brown, H. D. (1995). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy. *Language, 71*(4), 823–826. https://doi.org/10.2307/415773

Lubis, R. U., & Siregar, I. K. (2021). Improving students' speaking skill through debate. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics, 2*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.56874/jeel.v2i1.396

Muhayyang, M. (2023). Impact of anxiety and personality on speaking performance of public senior secondary school students. *Journal of Education Research, 2*(2), 172–178.

Najiha, S. B. (2021). An analysis of students' speaking anxiety in English classroom at SMAN 2 Siak Hulu. *Lectura: Jurnal Pendidikan, 12*(2), 327–332. https://doi.org/10.22141/2224-0721.16.4.2020.208486

Nur Hayati, S., & Kaniadewi, N. (2022). Analyzing types and levels of students' English-speaking anxiety. *ELLTER Journal, 3*(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.22236/ellter.v3i1.8832

*Corresponding author

IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859

Olkkonen, S., Snellings, P., Veivo, O., & Lintunen, P. (2024). Cognitive fluency in L2: The effect of automatic and controlled lexical processing on speech rate. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 53*(5), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-024-10099-0

Palijama, P. V. (2020). *Students' speaking problems in interpersonal speaking class* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana]. https://repository.uksw.edu

Peng, J. (2024). *Willingness to communicate in a second language*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009417884

Puji, R., & Ahmad, A. (2016). Learning style of MBTI personality types in history learning at higher education. *Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(6), 289–295. https://doi.org/10.27512/sjppi-ukm/ses/a13122016

Qadri, N., Abdul, N. B., & Maharida, M. (2023). Analysis of students' anxiety in speaking performance at Muhammadiyah University of Makassar. *Indonesian Journal of Psycholinguistics, 2*(1), 9–18. https://doi.org/10.56983/ijp.v2i1.470

Quenk, N. L. (2019). *Essentials of Myers–Briggs Type Indicator assessment* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Qurbi, E. (2025). Factors contributing to second language speaking development: Cognitive aspects and theoretical models. *Journal of Language Studies, 7*(9), 879–890.

Rahmadani, S., & Etfita, F. (2022). Foreign language speaking anxiety: A study of English language learning. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Review, 5*(2), 262–272. https://doi.org/10.23887/ijerr.v5i2.50284

Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.

Sabrina, H., & Khairunnisa, P. (2025). Speaking anxiety and factors in Indonesian EFL tertiary contexts: Exploring proficiency differences. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(2), 126–138.

Sekarsari, A. (2025). Hubungan psikolinguistik dalam pemerolehan dan pembelajaran bahasa. *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan, 3*(4), 233–238.

Tang, Y. (2025). A research review on MBTI-based second language acquisition teaching respecting individual personality traits. *Journal of Language Teaching Research, 13*(3), 3–6.

Yoskapela, Susanty, Bahing, & Ristati. (2022). A study on speaking anxiety of English education study program students at the University of Palangka Raya. *EBONY: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature, 2*(1), 14–27. https://doi.org/10.37304/ebony.v2i1.4065

Yusuf, N. Y. C., Yulianto, S. W., & Maulida, I. (2023). Students' English speaking anxiety: Levels and causes. *TLEMC (Teaching and Learning English in Multicultural Contexts), 7*(2), 141–150. https://doi.org/10.37058/tlemc.v7i2.8059

Zhang, J. (2025). The impact of MBTI occupational personality types on English-speaking anxiety among college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 1*, 183–187.

Zubaidah, Z., Hatija, E. R., Husna, N., & Sariyati, S. (2024). Peran tes kepribadian MBTI dalam proses konseling: Meningkatkan pemahaman dan pengembangan diri individu. *Menara Ilmu, 18*(1), 34–40. https://doi.org/10.31869/mi.v18i1.5430

Zulkifli, R. H. (2024). Recognizing and interpreting personality types of senior secondary students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 1*, 22–30.

*Corresponding author

IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education), 12 (2), 2025
P-ISSN: 2356-1777, E-ISSN: 2443-0390 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v12i2.48859