

THE INTERPLAY OF PERSONALITY FACTORS AND LANGUAGE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN DEVELOPING SPEAKING SKILL

Andi Asrawaty¹,

STIE Mujahidin, Buol, Indonesia
andiasrawaty@gmail.com¹

Bulqia Mas'ud²,

STAIN Majene, Majene, Indonesia
bulqiamasud@stainmajene.ac.id²

Nurul Imansari³

Universitas Sulawesi Barat, Majene, Indonesia
nurul.imansari@unsulbar.ac.id³

Abstract

Speaking skill was one of essential parts in language learning and needed to be mastered by every student for a better foreign language communication. The aims of this research were (1) to find out the language learning strategies used by the students based on their personality factors (2) to observe the extent to which the personality factors and language learning strategies correlate with speaking skill, (3) to elaborate the interplay of personality factors and language learning strategies in developing students' speaking skill. 25 students in the fourth semester of 2015/2016 class of English Education Department at Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP) Muhammadiyah Bone were selected by purposive sampling. The research employed mixed method of descriptive quantitative (correlation) and descriptive qualitative analysis. Quantitative data were collected first from questionnaires and speaking test and qualitative data from interview. The results of the research indicated that most of extrovert students prefer to use indirect learning strategies (69%) while introvert students prefer to use direct learning strategies (89%). The correlation of personality factors and speaking skills was low ($r=0.08$), whereas the correlation of language learning strategies and speaking skill was strong ($r=0.6$). Therefore, the interplay of personality factors and language learning strategies showed that personality factors contribute to important roles in choosing the appropriate language learning strategies in developing speaking skill.

Keywords: language learning strategies, personality factors, speaking skills

1. INTRODUCTION

Experts have specified three general sets of factors which contribute to individual differences in L2 learning: *cognitive, affective and social* (Skehan, 1989). Considering the personality factors as intrinsic aspects of affectivity in second language acquisition, this study will focus on personality factors includes extroversion and introversion

which firstly introduced in 1921 by German psychologist, Carl Jung.

Nowadays, extroversion as one of the personality factors has acquired most attention in the research of second language acquisition (SLA). Some SLA researchers have conventionally claimed that extroverts can learn language better (Van Daele et al., 2006) since they have great enthusiasm to speak out and desire

to communicate, that help to enhance the amount of effort and comprehensible language production (Swain, 1993).

Similarly, there is a popular opinion among teachers, that extroverts own superior L2 communicative skill and are more efficacious as foreign or second language learners (Lightbown & Spada, 1993). Consequently, the oral communication could easily be acquired and the extroverts' attitudes on target languages could be more flexible (Dewaele & Furnham, 2005), which further facilitate their foreign or second language learning. In addition, the claimed "extroverts are better than introverts" attracted many researchers to find the fact. However, the growing research is found inconsistent.

This inconsistent result might be caused by a notion that personality not only the single factor that effect the second language learning. One of important factors which is Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) as mentioned by O' Malley & Chamot (1990) that LLSs have possibility to be powerful learning facilities, and in junction with other techniques, it proved useful for language learning (Griffit, 2004).

There is a common understanding that the connection between personality and second language acquisition is a process of adjustment of each other (Ellis, 1994), and adequate proofs mention personality factors can assist acquisition of foreign language (Strong, 1983; Ely, 1986). In addition, since there is a robust relationship between psychological qualities and the strategies of language learners (Ehraman & Oxford, 1990), those traits can play the most important role in the field of LLSs. In such situation, Reiss (1983) found there was a significant relationship between the conscientiousness trait and successful language learning.

There are four skills or competences to be achieved in language learning, such as speaking and writing as productive competence, while reading and listening as receptive competence (Spratt et al., 2005). To be specific, this study focuses on speaking skill as a productive skill that need to be practiced for acquiring fluency. Khany (2013) revealed that personality traits affected foreign language learners' confidence in speaking. He added speaking confidence has highest positive correlation to extroversion (Khany, 2013) which is associated with outgoing, sociable, and talkative traits. The more extrovert the students, the more they want to take part in conversation and participate in class discussion. Hence, the more they practice their communication, the better their speaking skill.

In addition, some studies in language learning try to investigate the relationship between personality factors and learning strategies as the predictors in second language learning process. Fazely (2012) investigated the relationship between the Extraversion trait and use of the English Language Learning Strategies (ELLSs) among 213 students of English as a foreign language. The results show that there is a significant relationship between the Extraversion trait and use of the each of three of the six categories of ELLSs (Memory Strategies, Meta-cognitive Strategies, and Social Strategies). The positive relationship implies that the more extraverted students the more they used memory, meta-cognitive and social strategies.

Ibrahimoglu et al (2013) identified the relationship between personality types of college students and their learning styles. The results of the cluster analysis suggested two different personality profiles and the participants appeared to be equally distributed into

these two groups. In terms of learning styles, it was noticed that the majority of the participants adopted assimilating and diverging learning styles. The results revealed a meaningful relationship between learning styles and personality profiles.

Fazely (2012) and Ibrahimoglu et al (2013) only use single source of information to know students' learning style and strategies. The study by Farezy used self-report questioner of Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) to get learners language learning strategies' data and Ibrahimoglu used Kolb's Learning Styles Inventory to find out students' learning type. Despite the use of the same single source of research, the data is not clear enough to convince whether the students used style and strategies based on their actual learning process or only based on their beliefs and thought to choose the better style and strategies. Liang and Kelsen (2018) also found that extraversion significantly correlated with oral presentation alongside with social pressure and project work. They added that extraverts retain superiority in various situations where oral production of language was centered to communication (Liang & Kelsen, 2018).

Based on the weakness of the previous mentioned studies which is only used one single measurement to see students' learning strategies, this present study employed two measurements namely questionnaire and interview. Moreover, considering the positive result of the relationship between personality factors, learning strategies and speaking ability and limited research that conjoined the three variables altogether. this study will also highlight the choice of appropriate learning strategies based on learners' tendency of personality factor in developing students' speaking skill. Therefore, this research aims to

find the interplay of personality factor and learning strategies in developing speaking skill. Our hypotheses in this research are: 1) there is a correlation between personality factors and speaking skill (H1), 2) there is a correlation between language learning strategies and speaking skill (H2)

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The Role of Personality Factors in Developing Speaking Skill

Ibrahimoglu et al (2013) defined personality as an innate features and temperament arising in diverse situations and a mixture of a person's characteristics which separate him/her from others. The most common notion about personality was what had been popularized by Carl Jung which was further studied by numerous researchers, called extroversion and introversion. Brown (1994, p. 147) defined "extroversion as the extent to which a person has a deep-seated to receive ego enhancement, self-esteem and a sense of wholeness from other people as opposed to receiving that affirmation within oneself." This means that extrovert person needs more attention from other to show their existence. They could not be alone hence extroverts always have many friends and have ability to attract many people to contact them. Whereas introversion "extend to which a person derives a sense of wholeness and fulfillment apart from a reflection of this self from other people which is different from extroverts, introverts can have an inner strength of character that extroverts do not have" (Brown, 1994, p.147).

The study of MacIntyre and Charos (1996), Wakamoto (2000), Dawaele and Furnham's (2000) found that there is positive relationship between personality and second language acquisition. Wakamoto (2000) found that extroversion has significant correlation

with functional strategies, where the practice or the focus is on actual language usage and not on grammatical accuracy. Dewaele and Funhams (2000) studied the relationship between speech production and extroversion in assessment practice revealed that extroverts who speak two languages were more fluent than introverts who speak two languages particularly in interpersonally stressful conditions.

In contrast, the second studies found negative correlation between personality and second language acquisition are investigated by Erhman and Oxford (1995), Van Daele et al. (2006), and Ely (1986). Erhman and Oxford (1995) investigated the relationship between personality type of 76 students of English majors in Indonesia and academic performance in English as a Foreign Language course on vocabulary, reading comprehension, writing, and grammar. There is no other direct relationship of the two variables found, excluding the extroverts less capable on the vocabulary and composite course scores than introverts. Van Daele et al (2006) who also examined the impact of extroversion on the verbal fluency, linguistic complexity and accuracy exposed the extroversion did not influence oral fluency and syntactic complexity measured in either language.

The third claim Ellis (1994) which is more neutral identified two main discussions in the literature. The first promotes that extrovert learners will do better in obtaining basic interpersonal communication skills. The second retains that introvert learners will perform better at developing cognitive academic language ability. This controversy could happen because of some factors. The first possible factor is the different context, measurement tools and structure of the classroom setting in conducting research and it may impact

the different result in every different context, place and the number of participant. The second factor as Ellis claimed that both extroverts and introverts have strengths and weaknesses. Both can be successful in acquiring second language if they could take advantage for their strengths and overcome their weaknesses.

The Role of Language Learning Strategies in Developing Speaking Skill

Green and Oxford (1995, p. 262) stated that learning strategies have been broadly defined as “specific actions or techniques that students use, often intentionally, to improve their progress in developing L2 skills.” While, Richards et al (2002, p. 301) stated that “learning strategy is the ways in which learners attempt to work out the meaning and uses of words, grammatical rules, and other attempt to work out the meaning and uses of words, grammatical rules and other aspects of the language learning.”

Furthermore, direct strategies involve use of three groups of the subject matter: memory strategies, cognitive strategies, and compensation strategies. Oxford (1990, p.11) mentioned “memory strategies, for example creating mental linkages and employing actions, assist in entering information into long-term memory and retrieving information when needed for communication. Meanwhile, cognitive strategies are about student thoughts and compensation strategies related with how students make up their limited knowledge for example guessing unidentified words while reading and listening or using circumlocution in writing and grammar. In contrast, “indirect strategies contribute indirectly but powerfully to learning, and are also subdivided into three groups: metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.

Metacognitive strategies help learners exercise executive control through planning, arranging, focusing and evaluation of their own learning process.” (Oxford, 1990, p.11). Affective strategies employ the lowering of anxiety of a person, reassuring oneself, and captivating one’s own emotion, while the social strategies as questioning others and showing empathy to others (Oxford, 1990).

Most research has revealed that learning strategies have great influences and important roles in achieving success in second/foreign language learning. Many researchers have investigated the correlation between these two variables, learning strategies and second language learning (Ibrahimoglu, 2013; Fazely 2012; Huang, 2012; O’Mallay, Khan, 2010; Wakamoto 2000; Chamot, 1990, and Oxford 1990). Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) found higher proficiency students reported more functional practice strategies. Nakatani (2006) and Khan (2013) both investigated language learning studies for oral communication and their relationship to speaking proficiency. Nakatani (2006) also reported that high proficiency students used more strategies to interact and maintain conversation.

Speaking Skill

Richards & Renandya (2002) stated that effective verbal communication entails the capability to use the language suitably in social interactions that encompasses not only oral communication but also paralinguistic elements of language such as stress, pitch, and intonation. Moreover, nonlinguistic elements for instance body language, gesture and expressions are required in delivering messages directly without any complementary speech.

According to Heaton (1988) there are three indicators of speaking proficiency called accuracy, fluency, and

comprehensibility. Accuracy is definite as the capability to produce speech which is error-free (Housen & Kuiken, 2009). Rahman (2007) stated that accuracy in oral communication means someone can utter correct sentences in a good pronunciation, word choice, and grammar hence understood. Meanwhile, Simon and Schuster (1979) explained fluency as the quality of smoothness, expressiveness, freedom, and readiness of speech. Besides, comprehensibility is the practice of understanding of the statements sent by the speakers done by the listeners. Furthermore, comprehensibility in wider sense signifies the interpretation of meaning and uses the communication conveyed (Clark and Clark, 1977).

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1. Research Design

This research employed mix method design where the quantitative and qualitative are equally weighted and collected concurrently throughout the same study (Gay, 2006). Quantitative and Qualitative data in this research are both personality factors and language learning strategies, while students speaking skill was assessed by speaking test. Personality factors and language learning strategies were collected by using questionnaires. The qualitative data was collected by asking some questions regarding students’ personality traits and language learning strategies.

3.2. Population and Sample

The population of this research was all the students of English Education Department of Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP) Muhammadiyah Bone which in total are 240 students. The sample was selected using convenient sample techniques where students are easily contacted and purposive sampling technique for choosing sample to interview. The

sample of this research was 25 students in the quantitative analysis and 4 students in qualitative analysis.

3.3. Procedures of Collecting Data

The researcher used three kinds of instruments to collect the data. They were questionnaire, interview checklist and speaking test. The first procedure is by distributing questionnaires, namely Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) consisting 24 questions to access students' personality type and Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) to identify students' language learning strategies. The second procedures was conducting interview to recheck and support questionnaire. To find out the complete data, 4 students from introverts and extroverts were interviewed, two of each group who gained the highest score and two of each group acquire the lowest score. The last step was tested student speaking skill where students required to speak based on the picture given for one until three minutes.

3.4. Technique of Analyzing Data

The personality questionnaire was analyzed based on the total of Extraversion "E" score and the language learning strategies was identified based on the total of strategies used by the students. Furthermore, speaking skill was analyzed based on Heaton's rating score. The quantitative data, personality factors and language learning strategies were analyzed with students' speaking score by using Pearson's correlational study in SPSS. The qualitative data from interview were analyzed descriptively. Then the last procedure was compared and elaborated both qualitative and quantitative data.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Results

Students' Personality Type

This part shows the result of Extrovert ("E") Score of the students

that determined whether they were extrovert or introvert students. There were 24 questions in questionnaire which indicated student's extroversion scale. If the ranged of "E" score from 1 to 12, the student is categorized as introvert and if the ranged of "E" scores from 13 to 24, the student is identified as extrovert. Each of the 25 respondents was coded, for example, S01 for respondent 1 and S02 for respondent 2 and so forth.

Table. 1. "E" Score of Students' Personality Type by EPQ

No	SUBJECTS , CODE	Total of E Score	Personality (Questionnaire)	Personalit y Level
1	S01	13	Extrovert	Fairly
2	S02	7	Introvert	Fairly
3	S03	8	Introvert	Fairly
4	S04	18	Extrovert	Extreme
5	S05	13	Extrovert	Fairly
6	S06	13	Extrovert	Fairly
7	S07	15	Extrovert	Fairly
8	S08	5	Introvert	Extreme
9	S09	4	Introvert	Fairly
10	S10	13	Extrovert	Fairly
11	S11	4	Introvert	Extreme
12	S12	12	Extrovert	Fairly
13	S13	13	Extrovert	Fairly
14	S14	18	Extrovert	Extreme
15	S15	14	Extrovert	Fairly
16	S16	13	Extrovert	Fairly
17	S17	14	Extrovert	Fairly
18	S18	5	Introvert	Extreme
19	S19	4	Introvert	Extreme
20	S20	5	Introvert	Extreme
21	S21	8	Introvert	Fairly
22	S22	7	Introvert	Fairly
23	S23	4	Introvert	Extreme
24	S24	14	Extrovert	Fairly
25	S25	19	Extrovert	Extreme

Based on the questionnaire result, from 25 students, 14 students namely S02, S04, S05, S06, S07, S10, S12, S13, S14, S15, S16, S17, S24 and S25 were categorized as Extroverts. On extroversion level, the higher the E score, the higher also the extroversion level. The highest score was 19 indicates extreme extrovert by student S25, followed by student S04 and S14 with “E” score was 18, then score 15 by S07, score 14 by S07,S15, S17, score 13 by S01, S05, S06, S10, S13, S16 and S12, the lowest score of E score was 12 achieved by student 12.

On the contrary, in introversion level the lower E score the higher the introversion level. There were 11 students categorized as introvert namely S02, S03, S08, S09, S11, S18, S19, S20, S21, S22 and S23. The highest level of introvert, whose E score was 4, was gained by S23, S19,S11 and S09, then followed by S20, S18, and S08 whose E score was 5, then S02 and S22 whose E score was 7 and the last the E score was 8 by student S21 and S03. The students’ EPQ were show in details in table 4.

Moreover, we also conducted interview session to make sure the responses of quantitative procedure. Apparently, there were seven different results from questionnaire and interview result namely S02, S03, S06, S07, S10, S16, and S21. Questionnaire result of S02, S03 and S21 were introverts than in interview they were categorized as extroverts. S06, S07, S10 and S16 based on questionnaire were extroverts but categorized as introverts on interview result. If these results were observed more detail based on their level of “E” score, which S02 was 7, S03 was 8 and S21 was 8 they were classified are fairly introverts the same with S06 was 13, S07 was 15, S10 was 13 and S16 was 13 were classified as fairly extroverts. Because they are in fairly level, it is very

possible that students who were categorized as extrovert on questionnaire actually was introvert students or vice versa. It could happen if the students did not understand clearly the questions in questionnaire.

Table 2. The Comparison of Students’ Personality Types based on Questionnaire and Interview

No	SUBJECT S’ CODE	Personality (Questionnaire)	Personality (Interview)
1	S01	Extrovert	Extrovert
2	S02	Introvert	Extrovert
3	S03	Introvert	Extrovert
4	S04	Extrovert	Extrovert
5	S05	Extrovert	Extrovert
6	S06	Extrovert	Introvert
7	S07	Extrovert	Introvert
8	S08	Introvert	Introvert
9	S09	Introvert	Introvert
10	S10	Extrovert	Introvert
11	S11	Introvert	Introvert
12	S12	Extrovert	Extrovert

No	SUBJECT S’ CODE	Personality (Questionnaire)	Personality (Interview)
13	S13	Extrovert	Extrovert
14	S14	Extrovert	Extrovert
15	S15	Extrovert	Extrovert
16	S16	Extrovert	Introvert
17	S17	Extrovert	Extrovert
18	S18	Introvert	Introvert
19	S19	Introvert	Introvert
20	S20	Introvert	Introvert
21	S21	Introvert	Extrovert
22	S22	Introvert	Introvert
23	S23	Introvert	Introvert
24	S24	Extrovert	Extrovert
25	S25	Extrovert	Extrovert

In conclusion, the result of the research showed that students’ personality type based on questionnaire and interview showed that 13 students (52%) were categorized as extroverts and 12 students (48%) categorized as introvert. Whereas the result of students’ language learning strategies was indicated that 11 students (44%) preferred to use indirect learning

strategies and 14 students (56%) students tend to use direct than direct learning strategies.

Students' Language Learning Strategies

This part is the identification of students' LLS which was obtained from questionnaire and interview. This identification was adapted from Oxford's classification of Language Learning Strategies into direct and indirect learning strategies.

Table 3. The Result of Students Language Learning Strategies based on Oxford Classification

No	SUBJECTS' CODE	Total A+B+C (direct)	Total D+E+F (indirect)
1	S01	10.4	13.9
2	S02	7.2	8.1
3	S03	10.4	9.4
4	S04	11	11.8
5	S05	10.9	11.3
6	S06	12	10.8
7	S07	7.8	9.7
8	S08	10.4	9.1
9	S09	11.1	10.7
10	S10	8.2	8
11	S11	7.2	8.1
12	S12	11	10.5
13	S13	10.8	10.6
14	S14	8.4	8.5
15	S15	8.4	11.3
16	S16	12	8.6
17	S17	9.6	8.1
18	S18	10.4	9.1
19	S19	8.2	8
20	S20	7.5	7.1
21	S21	9.8	10.3
22	S22	10.1	8.2
23	S23	7.3	7.2
24	S24	9.9	7.5
25	S25	7.6	9.9

Based on the table, the SILL questionnaires result showed that 11

students (44%) preferred to use indirect learning strategies and 14 (56%) students tend to use direct than indirect learning strategies.

The Association of Personality Factors and Language Learning Strategies on Students' Speaking Skills.

In the first analysis, we determine the relationship between personality factors and students' speaking skill. In the second analysis, we determine the relationship between language learning strategies and students' speaking skill.

The third analysis seeks to understand the interplay of personality factors and language learning strategies toward students' speaking skill. In addition, we also compare the speaking skill based on those indicators (fluency, accuracy, comprehensibility) between extrovert and introvert students.

Table 4. Pearson Correlation Analysis between Personality Factors and Speaking Skills

PF	SS	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
1	.089			25
25	.673			25
.08	.089			25
.67	.673			25

Based on the table, the correlation of personality factors and students speaking skills showed that Pearson's correlation coefficient from SPSS was 0.08, close to 0 means of language learning strategies and students' speaking skills showed low correlation. Based on this analysis, H1 was accepted but it showed very low relationship. In other words, there is weak correlation between personality factor and students' speaking skill.

Table 5. Pearson Correlation Analysis between Language Learning Strategies and Speaking Skills

Correlations		LLS	SS
LS	Pearson Correlation	1	.668**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	25	25
SS	Pearson Correlation	.668**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	25	25

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Meanwhile, the table showed that there is an association between Language Learning Strategies and Speaking Skill with p-value < 0.5, and the Pearson's correlation coefficient was r=0.668 which mean there is a significant correlation between language learning strategies and students' speaking score. This means our hypothesis H2 is accepted. The more strategies used the by the students the higher their speaking score.

Table 6. The Comparison of Mean Score of the Speaking Score between Extrovert and Introvert

Personality	Fluency	Accuracy	Comprehensibility	Total
Extroverts	4.53	3.76	3.92	4.07
Introverts	3.66	4.41	3.83	3.97

Based on the table, the total speaking score of both extroverts and introverts were almost same. The interesting finding was the result of students' speaking score in the three indicators, fluency, accuracy, and comprehensibility. There were significant difference between fluency and accuracy of both extrovert and introvert personality. Regarding fluency, extroverts had higher score with mean score 4.53 whereas introverts were better on accuracy with mean score 4.41.

In the last analysis, we found the tendency of students with extrovert or introvert personality with learning

strategies they use. The data is showed as follows:

Table 7. The Language Learning Strategies based on Students' Personality Factors.

Extrovert Students' Code	Language Learning Strategies	Introvert Students' Code	Language Learning Strategies
S01	Indirect	S06	Direct
S02	Indirect	S07	Indirect
S03	Direct	S08	Direct
S04	Indirect	S09	Direct
S05	Indirect	S10	Direct
S12	Direct	S11	Indirect
S13	Direct	S16	Direct
S14	Indirect	S18	Direct
S15	Indirect	S19	Direct
S17	Indirect	S20	Direct
S21	Indirect	S22	Direct
S24	Direct	S23	Direct
S25	Indirect		
Total Extroverts' LLS		Total Introverts' LLS	
Indirect : 9 (69.2 %)		Indirect : 2 (16.6 %)	
Direct : 4 (30.7 %)		Direct : 10 (83.3 %)	

Based on the table, the relationship between students' personality and language learning strategies showed that most extrovert students (69.2%) tend to use indirect learning. Whereas, most introvert students (83.3%) tend to use direct learning. As an attempt to know the interplay of personality factors and language learning strategies on developing students' speaking skill, we may compare mean score of student speaking involved their personality type, and language learning strategies.

Table.8 Students' personality types, language learning strategies, and speaking score

Personality	Indirect Language Learning Strategies	Direct Language Learning Strategies	Speaking Score
Extroverts	69.2 %	30.7%	4.07
Introverts	16.6%	83.3%	3.97

4.2. Discussion

This research showed that both the qualitative and quantitative data supported that extrovert and introvert students have the same chance to success in acquiring second language learning specially speaking skills. Quantitative data of personality type and speaking skill showed low correlation based on Pearson's correlation coefficient ($r=0.08$). These results were also supported by interview result that personality factor did not have direct influence of achieving the success in second language learning particularly in speaking.

Those findings reject the common claim that extroverts are better than introverts. It is in line with the previous studies by Erhman & Oxford (1995), Van Daele *et al* (2006) and Ely (1986), who found low correlation even negative correlation between personality factors and the students' speaking score.

Erhman & Oxford (1995) found no direct relationship between extroversion and second language competence among reading comprehension, vocabulary, grammar and writing. Similarly, Van Daele *et al* (2006) and Ely (1986) found negative correlation between extroversion level and speaking skills. Van Daele *et al* (2006) who also investigated the effect of extroversion on the oral fluency, accuracy and linguistic complexity revealed that the extroversion did not affect syntactic complexity and oral fluency measures in either language.

Moreover, this current research is against MacIntyre & Charos (1996) research which found negative correlation between extroversion and language anxiety, suggesting that extroverts communicated more in the second language than introverts. It is also opposed to Dewaele & Furnhams (2000) who studied the relationship between extroversion and speech production in assessment situations which revealed that extrovert bilinguals were more fluent than introvert bilinguals, especially in interpersonally stressful situations. Our findings revealed that extrovert personality does not always have better speaking skill.

This non-significant correlation between personality type and speaking skill can be possibly caused by some factors, for instance whether extroverts or introverts had their own strengths and weaknesses. Although the result of the study showed that extroverts were better in fluency than introverts, it does not mean that they are better than introverts. The extroverts have ability to speak more since they are more talkative than introvert, but the accuracy is not better than the introverts. Meanwhile, introvert students were better in accuracy. Furthermore, this result is related to Ellis (1994) who claimed that extroverts are better in basic interpersonal communication skill, therefore they have opportunity to get more input and practice their English since strengthened by higher fluency. Furthermore, Ellis (1994) also claimed that even though extroverts were better in basic interpersonal communication skill, introverts were better in cognitive academic language ability.

Moreover, our findings showed that one of significant factors that played important roles in achieving success in second language learning was language learning strategies. Pearson correlation

coefficient of language learning strategies and students' speaking skill score was 0.668 close to 1, indicated strong relationship between two variables. Thus, the more language learning strategies used by the students the higher their speaking score. In spite of students' diverse personalities, language learning strategies predict more in developing their speaking skill. This research suggests that strategy in learning second or foreign language should be prioritized since it outweighs the personality factor potentials.

Even though personality factor did not influenced speaking skill directly, the data show personality factors have important roles in choosing the appropriate language learning strategies. Our study proved that most extrovert students (63%) preferred to use indirect learning and most introvert students (83%) preferred to use direct learning. The identification of personality factor does help the strategies to use in developing speaking skill.

In conclusion, personality factors influenced the choice of language learning strategies and the more language learning strategies used the higher students' speaking score. This is consistent with what has been claimed by O'Malley *et al* (1990) that language learning strategies (LLSs) have potential to be an extremely powerful learning tool. It is also in line with Griffiths (2004) said that good techniques in learning foreign language may well prove to be an extremely useful tool for learners' language learning. It implies that personality factors have indirect contribution and language learning strategies have direct contribution in developing speaking skills.

5. CONCLUSION

The researcher concluded that both personality factors and language learning strategies have contribution in developing students' speaking skills. Even though personality factor do not predict well the ability to speak English, personality factors still influence the students' choice of using language learning strategies which was given direct contribution in developing students' speaking skills. Students should be aware of their different types of personality since they are particularly important in identifying their tendency in using appropriate language learning strategies and also knowing their strength and weaknesses. Therefore, they can use various language learning strategies to overcome their limitation and enhance their special ability based on their personalities. Teacher should provide various teaching strategies and materials to facilitate all personality types in teaching and learning process. Finally, the limitation of this study is the small number of participants used hence it might affect the result. In addition, this study is also limited with current resources and the study cannot be generalized as well. Therefore, further research with large number of participants and updated relevant resources are immensely encouraged.

REFERENCES

- Aziz, Rebin, A. (2010). *Extraversion-Introversion and The Oral Performance of Koya University EFL Students*. Unpublished Thesis, Bilkent University.
- Brown, H. Douglas (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Prentice Hall inc.
- Clark, H. H. and E. V. Clark. (1977). *Psychology and Language Introduction to Psycholinguistics*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Dewaele J-M. & Furnham A. (2000). Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28: 355–365
- Ehrman M., & Oxford R. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(1): 67–89.
- Ellis R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press
- Ely CM. (1986). An analysis of discomfort, risk taking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning*, 36(1): 1-25.
- Eysenck, H. & Eysenck, S. (1975). *Persian Version of the Manual of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. Hodder & Stoughton.
- Gay L R. (2006). *Education Research, Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Merrill Publishing.
- Griffiths C. (2004). Using Reading as a Strategy for Teaching and Learning Language. *Paper presented at the International Conference on First and Second Literacy Strategies*. College Park.
- Housen, A., & Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Appl. Linguist.*, 30(4), 461-473.
- Ibrahimoglu, N, et al (2013). The Relationship between Personality Traits and Learning Styles: A Cluster Analysis. *Journal of Education and Practice*, (93-108)
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Personality types*. The portable Jung
- Khan, Sarah. (2010). *Strategies and Spoken Production on Three Oral Communication Tasks: A Study of High and Low Proficiency EFL Learners*. Doctoral Thesis: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
- Khany, R., & Ghoreyshi, M. (2013). The nexus between Iranian EFL students' Big Five personality traits and foreign language speaking confidence. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2s), pp-601.
- Liang, H. Y., & Kelsen, B. (2018). Influence of personality and motivation on oral presentation performance. *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 47(4), 755-776.
- Lightbown P. & Spada N. (1993). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.
- MacIntyre P.D. & Charos C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15: 3-26.
- O'Malley JM & Chamot AU. (1990) *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press

- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Newbury House Publisher.
- Rahman, Abd. (2007). *Improving Speaking Skill by Using Jigsaw Technique*. Unpublished Thesis : UIN Alauddin.
- Reiss MA. (1983). Helping the Unsuccessful Language Learner. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 39(2), 257-266.
- Richard, J. C, and W.A. Renandya. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Currect Practice*. Cambridge University.
- Simon and Schuster. (1979). *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary Unabridged* (Second Edition). New World Dictionaries.
- Sato, T. (2005). The Eysenck personality questionnaire brief version: Factor structure and reliability. *The Journal of psychology*, 139(6), 545-552.
- Spratt M., Pulverness A & William M. (2005). *The TKT (Teaching Knowledge Test) Course*. Cambridge University Press
- Skehan P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning*. Edward Arnold.
- Strong M. (1983). Social Styles and The Second Language Acquisition of SPANISH Speaking Kindergartners. *TEOSL-Quarterly*, 17(2), 241-258.
- Swain M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50(1), 158-164.
- Van Daele S. Housen, A., Pierrard, M., & Debruyne, L. (2006). The effect of extroversion on oral L2 proficiency. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 6, 213–236.

