

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of the study organized around the three research questions. For each question, findings from classroom observation are integrated with themes drawn from student interviews and, where relevant, from the lecturer interview. Participant names are used with consent; the lecturer is referred to as the "course lecturer" throughout.

A. How Learners with Different MBTI Types Experience the Process of Developing English Speaking Skills

1. Introverted Types: Preparation as the Foundation of Performance

A consistent and striking pattern emerged across the introverted participants: speaking performance was experienced not as a spontaneous communicative act but as the culmination of an intensive private preparation process. Students typed as INFP, INFJ, INTJ, ISTJ, and ISFP all described preparation rituals that were thorough, deliberate, and central to their experience of speaking.

FS (INFP) described her preparation as rehearsing her speech many times alone in her room before the assessment, writing her points down in detail beforehand. Her classroom observation data confirmed a structured speaking style with moderately active participation and occasional signs of anxiety. What was most notable in both her interview and her observation, however, was the progressive quietening of her voice as the performance continued, a phenomenon she herself attributed to the mounting anxiety of being watched. This pattern, initial preparation giving way to in-the-moment anxiety, appeared repeatedly among introverted participants and points to a fundamental tension

between the private competence that preparation builds and the public vulnerability that performance demands.

Importantly, however, this tension is not fixed: when INFP students channeled their characteristic sensitivity and depth into genuine engagement with their chosen topic, the result could be a speaking performance of considerable strength, demonstrating fluency, clear articulation, and confident presence that transcended the limitations more typically associated with introversion.

“I think it is because I start to lose confidence midway. At first I feel okay, but then when I notice people looking at me, I get more and more anxious. My voice just fades.” (FS, Interview, May 5, 2025)

JA (INFJ) articulated this tension with particular clarity. Describing her experience of the speaking assessment, she explained that writing was her natural mode of expression because it allowed for editing and reflection, speaking, by contrast, felt exposed. Her observation record noted frequent and prolonged pausing, which JA herself interpreted not as forgetting but as careful thinking: she was searching for precisely the right word, monitoring the accuracy of her output in real time. This real-time monitoring, while producing linguistically careful speech, also produced the visible hesitations that can be misread by observers as a sign of insufficient preparation or low ability.

This phenomenon corresponds precisely to what Krashen (1982) terms over-monitoring, an excessive reliance on the conscious monitor during performance that interrupts fluency without improving accuracy. Hanifa et al. (2022) similarly documented that introverted EFL learners frequently engage in real-time self-correction processes

during speaking that produce observable pausing and hesitation, confirming that JA's experience is not idiosyncratic but a documented feature of introverted speaking behavior in EFL contexts.

“When I pause, I am actually thinking very carefully about what I want to say. I do not want to say something inaccurate or unclear. But I realize it might look like I am forgetting or losing track.” (JA, Interview, May 6, 2025)

IK (INTJ) represented a variation on this pattern. Like other introverted participants, she prepared thoroughly and spoke in a structured, organized manner, her observation showed fluent delivery, within-time performance, and strong vocabulary and grammar. The deficit that appeared in her observation data, however, was eye contact: she rarely scanned the audience, preferring to fix her gaze on a single point. In the interview, she explained this as a function of concentration rather than anxiety, making eye contact, she said, caused her to start reading the audience's reactions, which interrupted her internal processing. This observation highlights an important distinction that the course lecturer also noted: a student may be highly competent linguistically while appearing communicatively disengaged, and personality type helps explain why.

“Eye contact sometimes distracts me because I start reading people's reactions and it breaks my concentration.” (IK, Interview, May 8, 2025)

MA (ISTP) presented a somewhat different profile within the introverted cluster. His observation data described him as very fluent, confident, with clear pronunciation, notably stronger delivery indicators than most other introverted participants. In the interview, he attributed this to a philosophy of calm acceptance: he prepared well and then

released the outcome. His ISTP profile, characterized by practical, task-focused problem-solving and the emotional detachment that Jung (1921) associates with the introverted thinking function, appeared to function as a buffer against the performance anxiety that troubled his introverted peers.

“Preparation and acceptance. I prepare well so I know my material. And then I accept that whatever happens, happens. I do not catastrophize.” (MA, Interview, May 9, 2025)

Pang et al. (2024) note that the relationship between introversion and speaking performance is non-linear: when introverted students develop effective compensatory strategies and a stable motivational base, their performance outcomes can match or exceed those of extroverted peers. MA’s case is a compelling illustration of this argument, and it cautions against treating introversion as a monolithic predictor of speaking difficulty. The specific combination of MBTI preferences, not introversion alone, is the operative variable.

2. Extroverted Types: Energy, Presence, and the Risk of Losing the Thread

Extroverted participants, those typed as ENFJ, ENFP, ENTP, ESTP, and ENTJ, uniformly described speaking in front of the class as an energizing rather than depleting experience. Unlike their introverted peers, who experienced the public dimensions of speaking as a challenge to be managed, extroverted students experienced them as the point. The audience, for these students, was a resource rather than a threat.

MG (ENFJ) embodied this orientation most fully. Her observation data was the strongest among all participants: she demonstrated high confidence, consistent eye contact, strong body language, within-time delivery, relevant content, and varied vocabulary, the full constellation of qualities associated with polished public speaking. In the interview, she

described how she reads her audience continuously while speaking, slowing down naturally when she senses confusion. This real-time audience adjustment is characteristic of ENFJs, who are among the most interpersonally attuned of MBTI types. Her case illustrates the speaking advantage that extroverted, feeling-oriented personality types tend to enjoy in conventional speaking assessments.

“I am very aware of my audience. I read their faces and adjust my energy accordingly. If I see someone looking confused, I naturally slow down and clarify.” (MG, Interview, May 10, 2025)

FD (ENTP) illustrated both the strengths and the characteristic pitfalls of the extroverted speaking style. His observation showed a confident, fluent speaker, the course lecturer commented that he exuded high confidence. However, the observation also noted that he frequently finished too quickly, repeating content to fill the allotted time, and that his speech was only somewhat relevant to the assigned topic. In the interview, FD acknowledged this pattern candidly: he prioritized delivery over substance, relying on his natural fluency to carry him through.

He recognized that this approach had a ceiling: there comes a point where confident delivery cannot compensate for thin content. His insight points to an important limitation of the extrovert advantage, it produces performance quality that is highly visible but does not necessarily reflect the depth of linguistic or conceptual knowledge.

“When I get excited about a topic, I accelerate. I know the content but I deliver it faster than the listener can absorb.” (FD, Interview, May 9, 2025)

VI (ENFP) experienced a version of this challenge from a different angle. Described in her observation as active and clear-voiced, she showed signs of anxiety and had several notable pauses, moments when she appeared to lose her train of thought. In the interview, she described having too many ideas at once, with her brain jumping ahead of her words. This is a recognizable ENFP pattern: the enthusiasm and creativity that makes this type engaging in conversation can also produce speech that is associatively organized rather than linearly structured, leading to moments of visible disorientation. VI's case illustrates that extroversion does not guarantee fluency, and that the particular combination of extroversion with intuition and perceiving produces a distinctive set of speaking challenges.

Tursina (2022) identified this tendency among extroverted Perceiving types in an Indonesian EFL context, noting that their preference for spontaneity can produce characteristic incoherence in extended speaking tasks. Quenk (2019) similarly describes the ENFP's dominant function, extroverted intuition, as generative of multiple simultaneous associations, a cognitive style that is creative in informal speech but that can work against the linear demands of formal presentations. The implication for instruction is clear: ENFP students benefit less from more preparation time and more from structured organizational frameworks, templates, outlines, and signposting strategies, that channel their generative thinking into coherent spoken argument.

“My brain jumps ahead and then when I try to speak, I lose the thread. It is not that I do not know the material, it is more like I have too many ideas at once.” (VI, Interview, May 7, 2025)

AP (ENFJ) offered an illuminating account of a phenomenon specific to performance-oriented extroverts: the paradox of trying too hard. The observation noted active participation but visible nervousness and frequent stumbling, a contrast to what might be expected from an ENFJ. In the interview, AP explained that she was too focused on performing well, with the result that the self-consciousness about performance undermined the very fluency it was meant to produce. This counterintuitive finding, that caring too much can impair an extrovert's natural speaking strengths, was also noted by the course lecturer, who observed that some of the most expressive students became their own obstacles when the assessment stakes were high.

By contrast, extroverted participants with a judging preference tended to resolve this tension more successfully: their natural orientation toward planning and structure ensured that delivery confidence was supported by well-prepared content, producing performances that were strong across both delivery and substance dimensions.

3. The Lecturer's Perspective: Recognizing the Person Behind the Performance

“I was very eager to speak but then I kept stumbling on words. I think I was too focused on performing well that I ended up tripping over my sentences.” (AP, Interview, May 5, 2025)

The course lecturer's account provided a rich pedagogical frame for the student data. Describing years of classroom observation, the lecturer confirmed the patterns identified above: students at the expressive, extroverted end of the spectrum tend to dominate the visible dimensions of performance, eye contact, voice projection, confidence, and fluency, while their quieter counterparts may be wrongly perceived as less capable. The

lecturer was explicit on this point: the quieter students are not necessarily less competent; sometimes they have the most accurate grammar and the most thoughtful content.

The lecturer also offered a nuanced account of the limits of current assessment practice. The standard rubric in use, covering fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary range, and interaction, is applied uniformly, without reference to personality type. This means that a student whose introversion produces careful, low-volume, pausing speech is assessed by the same criteria as a student whose extroversion produces loud, fluid, audience-oriented delivery. The structural advantage this creates for extroverted types is not offset by any mechanism in the current rubric.

The lecturer expressed openness to MBTI-informed assessment, however, with a clear concern for maintaining academic standards. The distinction drawn, between adjusting standards and adjusting how performance is interpreted, is a theoretically important one. MBTI awareness in assessment does not mean giving introverted students lower expectations; it means understanding that a quiet, pausing delivery style may reflect a personality trait rather than a language learning deficit, and weighting content quality, linguistic accuracy, and preparation evidence accordingly.

B. Challenges and Strengths Associated with Particular MBTI Types in English Speaking Practice

1. Introverted Types: Strengths in Depth, Challenges in Delivery

Across the introverted participants, a clear profile of strengths and challenges emerged that was consistent with theoretical predictions while also revealing contextual specificities particular to the Indonesian university setting.

“Speaking is not just a linguistic skill, it is a deeply personal act. How someone communicates is shaped by who they are.” (Course Lecturer, Interview, May 12, 2025)

The primary strength of introverted speakers in this study was content quality. Participants typed as INFJ, INTJ, ISTJ, and INFP all demonstrated careful preparation, organized argument structure, and attention to linguistic accuracy. ED (INFJ), whose observation notes recorded strong vocabulary and supportive body language, described a deliberate strategy of preparing a strong opening and closing, anchoring devices that allowed her to manage the uncertainty of the content in between. This strategic approach to managing the demands of performance is characteristic of introverted types who have developed effective coping mechanisms for their natural discomfort with public exposure.

“Making direct eye contact feels very intense for me. I often look slightly above the audience or focus on one area. It is not that I am disengaged, I am very much engaged internally.” (ED, Interview, May 8, 2025)

AW (ISTJ), one of the two ISTJ participants, described a preparation strategy involving memorization of exact sentences, which provided the reliability that ISTJ types characteristically seek but also created rigidity: when something went off-script, recovery was difficult. The observation data confirmed this picture, noting a flat, minimally expressive delivery. AW was self-aware about this: he understood that his flat expressiveness was not a lack of effort but a reflection of a communication style that prioritizes information accuracy over performance animation. This self-awareness, while personally healthy, does not resolve the structural problem that conventional speaking assessment tends to reward animation over accuracy.

This tension connects directly to Marpaung and Widyantoro's (2020) finding that learners with strong conscientiousness and memory strategy use, both characteristic of the ISTJ profile, frequently outperform personality predictions on content measures while underperforming on delivery measures. Oxford's (1990) memory strategies, which ISTJ types favor, optimize for retention and accuracy rather than for the spontaneous expressiveness that delivery-weighted rubrics reward. The result is a systematic misalignment between this type's natural learning strengths and the performance dimensions that conventional assessment prioritizes, a misalignment that is not a failure of the student but of the assessment instrument.

The challenges faced by introverted participants converged around three areas. First, voice projection: many introverted students spoke at lower volumes than ideal for the classroom setting, sometimes to the point where the lecturer or the observer had difficulty hearing clearly. This was noted in the observation data for FS (INFP), NH (ISFP), and JA (INFJ), among others. Second, eye contact: most introverted participants made minimal eye contact with the audience, either focusing on a fixed point, looking downward, or scanning rarely. Third, spontaneous recovery: when things went off-script, a forgotten point, an unexpected response from the audience, or a moment of linguistic uncertainty, introverted participants generally found it more difficult to recover gracefully than their extroverted peers.

"I know that is not always what is rewarded in assessments. People might think I am bored or uninterested, but I am actually very focused. I just express focus differently, through accuracy and structure, not through animation." (AW, Interview, May 10, 2025)

NH (ISFP) articulated the freezing experience that several introverted participants described: when very nervous, she simply stopped moving, unsure what to do with her body. The observation confirmed a body language described as distracting, still to the point of rigidity. NH's account points to a dimension of speaking anxiety that goes beyond linguistic competence: for some introverted students, the physical demands of public performance produce a kind of cognitive overload that momentarily overwhelms their available resources for language production. This aligns with MacIntyre and Gardner's (1994) model of foreign language anxiety, in which somatic symptoms, physical tension and freezing, represent the behavioral manifestation of cognitive overload in high-stakes communicative contexts.

This pattern is also consistent with Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) foundational construct of foreign language classroom anxiety, which similarly identifies physical and behavioral symptoms, alongside cognitive and emotional ones, as core manifestations of anxiety in second-language performance contexts. Kelsen (2019) similarly found that introversion was among the strongest personality-level predictors of public speaking anxiety in EFL contexts, with physically visible anxiety responses most pronounced among feeling-oriented introverted types. NH's ISFP profile, introversion combined with a dominant function of introverted feeling, places her at exactly the intersection of risk factors this research identifies, pointing toward the importance of graduated exposure and explicit anxiety-management strategy instruction for students of this type.

2. Extroverted Types: Strengths in Delivery, Challenges in Depth and Accuracy

Extroverted participants consistently demonstrated strengths in the delivery dimensions of speaking: vocal presence, eye contact, audience engagement, and spontaneous fluency. However, a recurring pattern in both observation and interview data pointed to a characteristic challenge: depth of content.

“I just freeze. I do not know what to do with my hands or my body, so I just stand there. I know it looks strange but I cannot help it.” (NH, Interview, May 7, 2025)

GH (ESTP), who described his approach as simply going for it without over-preparing, produced a performance that the observation noted as fairly clear in articulation but limited in content. In the interview, GH acknowledged that his delivery was generally competent but that his content could be thin, he had not invested sufficiently in the substance of what he wanted to say. The ESTP profile, practical, action-oriented, with a strong preference for improvisation over planning, naturally produces this trade-off: strong in-the-moment performance capability but sometimes underprepared in terms of material. Mustafidah (2023) documented this pattern specifically among extroverted students in Indonesian EFL contexts, finding that extroverts’ higher scores on delivery-related dimensions were frequently accompanied by lower scores on content coherence and topic depth.

“I do not over-prepare. I prefer to speak spontaneously and see where it goes. Preparation makes me feel too stiff.” (GH, Interview, May 6, 2025)

Consistent with Oxford’s (1990) strategy framework, ESTP learners gravitate toward social and compensation strategies, strategies that sustain communicative

momentum in the face of gaps, rather than the cognitive and memory strategies that produce well-developed content. The instructional implication is that ESTP students do not need more speaking practice; they need structured content preparation routines that counterbalance their natural preference for spontaneous performance over deliberate preparation.

FD (ENTP) represents perhaps the most extreme case of this pattern. His observation noted that he frequently repeated content because he had exhausted his prepared material ahead of time, and the course lecturer specifically commented on his combination of high confidence and thin content. FD himself, in the interview, accepted this feedback as fair: he acknowledged relying too heavily on his improvisational ability and neglecting the preparation of substantive content. His ENTP profile, quick-thinking, debate-oriented, attracted to ideas over details, makes this pattern almost predictable.

3. Mixed and Unexpected Patterns

Several participants did not fit cleanly into the predicted introverted or extroverted pattern, and these cases are among the most instructive in the dataset. Notably, some participants classified as ENFJ, a type generally associated with confident, audience-aware communication, demonstrated speaking performances that diverged considerably from theoretical predictions. These mismatches appear to reflect the interaction between personality-based tendencies and the degree of English language proficiency: where the challenge is fundamentally linguistic rather than psychological, the expected ENFJ strengths in delivery and audience engagement may not manifest, serving as an important reminder that MBTI type predicts tendencies, not outcomes.

C. Influence of MBTI Traits on Confidence, Motivation, and Speaking Interactions

1. Confidence: A Multidimensional Construct

One of the most significant findings of this study is that confidence in speaking is not a unidimensional quality that can be straightforwardly observed from the outside. Both student interviews and the lecturer's account converged on the insight that confidence is experienced and expressed very differently across personality types, and that conventional assessment rubrics tend to capture only its most visible extroverted manifestations.

For extroverted participants, confidence was often experienced as a felt sense of energy and connection with the audience. MG (ENFJ) described feeling energized by the audience, with the audience's size positively correlated with her confidence rather than inversely. For introverted participants, confidence took a different form, it was experienced as the product of thorough preparation, as a private inner assurance that one knows one's material, rather than as a socially expressed energy. ED (INFJ) described enjoying speaking activities more than people might expect from an introvert, provided that the environment felt safe and supportive, a condition-dependent form of confidence that is qualitatively different from the unconditional performance energy of extroverted types. This distinction maps directly onto Jung's (1921) foundational account of introversion as an orientation toward inner experience: for introverted individuals, psychological energy is generated internally rather than socially, and confidence therefore grows through mastery of content rather than through the act of public performance itself.

As Aljuaid (2022) demonstrated in an EFL context, when the assessment environment does not provide the psychological safety that introverted students require,

their observable confidence may fail to reflect their actual linguistic competence, producing evaluations that capture personality-based comfort more than language ability. This structural asymmetry, documented in the present study through both student accounts and the lecturer's observations, represents one of the most consequential ways in which personality type intersects with speaking assessment.

The course lecturer made an important pedagogical distinction in this regard: delivery aspects such as eye contact, body language, voice projection, and apparent confidence are most visibly affected by personality type, while content-related aspects, vocabulary range, grammatical accuracy, topic relevance, are more evenly distributed across personality profiles. This means that a uniform assessment rubric that weights delivery heavily will systematically favor extroverted types, not because extroverts know more English, but because their personality naturally produces the observable performance indicators that such rubrics reward.

Several introverted participants expressed awareness of this structural disadvantage, and their accounts revealed that it had real affective consequences. JA (INFJ) articulated a concern about fairness: a student who speaks slowly and pauses a lot might actually have very deep and accurate content, she observed, but if only fluency is judged, that student gets a lower score. This is not merely a theoretical concern, it is a lived experience of evaluative injustice that shapes introverted students' relationship with speaking activities and, ultimately, with English language learning itself.

2. Motivation: Intrinsic Engagement versus Performance Anxiety

Table 1 below presents a consolidated overview of the MBTI-speaking profiles of all twelve interview participants before the motivational patterns underlying each profile are discussed in detail.

Table 1. Summary of MBTI Personality Types and Speaking Profiles

Name	MBTI	Speaking Strengths	Speaking Challenges	Confidence Style	Motivation Style
FS	INFP	Rich content, authentic expression, genuine engagement	Soft voice, eye contact, spontaneous delivery	Internal; preparation-based	Mastery & topic authenticity
JA	INFJ	Precise language, careful word choice, strong content	Over-monitoring, prolonged pausing, delivery anxiety	Private; competence-based	Accuracy & depth
IK	INTJ	Structured delivery, accuracy, thorough preparation	Flat affect, minimal audience connection	Internal; mastery-oriented	Precision & personal standards
NH	ISFP	Warm, sincere communication style	Physical freezing, voice projection, anxiety	Highly context-dependent	Topic interest & safe environment
ED	INFJ	Content quality, emotional sincerity	Condition-dependent confidence, delivery vulnerability	Internal; safety-contingent	Relational meaning & connection
MA	ISTP	Fluency, clarity, confident delivery, calm presence	Minimal audience expressiveness	Stable; acceptance-based	Practical mastery & equanimity
AW	ISTJ	Accuracy, systematic preparation, reliable content	Flat expressiveness, delivery animation	Steady; accuracy-driven	Duty & thoroughness
AP	ENFJ	Audience awareness, expressive delivery	Performance anxiety when over-focused on outcome	Social; audience-generated	Relational connection & impact
MG	ENFJ	Charismatic delivery, audience reading, engagement	Content can be surface-level under pressure	High; socially energized	Audience connection & approval
VI	ENFP	Enthusiastic, clear voice, active audience engagement	Topic drift, associative structure, thin content	Variable; topic-dependent	Creative expression & novelty
FD	ENTP	Confident, intellectually engaging, idea-rich delivery	Organization, staying on topic, time management	High; debate-oriented	Intellectual challenge & argument
GH	ESTP	Strong delivery, confident presence, clear articulation	Content depth, preparation thoroughness	High; performance-driven	Action & in-the-moment engagement

Note. Table summarizes the twelve interview participants' MBTI profiles alongside the key patterns identified through classroom observation and thematic interview analysis. Confidence and motivation descriptors are derived from participants' own accounts and observer field notes. MBTI type codes: I = Introverted, E = Extroverted, N = Intuitive, S = Sensing, F = Feeling, T = Thinking, J = Judging, P = Perceiving.

The relationship between MBTI type and motivation proved to be more complex than a simple introvert-disengaged / extrovert-engaged dichotomy. Several introverted participants demonstrated high intrinsic motivation for English language learning and genuine enthusiasm for speaking activities in appropriate conditions, while several extroverted participants revealed that the pressure of formal assessment could undermine the spontaneous energy that characterizes their natural speaking style.

IK (INTJ) was particularly articulate about the motivation-personality relationship. She described feeling relatively in control and confident when well-prepared, with low tolerance for giving hasty or inaccurate answers. Her motivation was clearly oriented toward mastery and precision rather than toward social performance, what Aljuaid (2022) terms an “internally-regulated motivational orientation,” in which the drive to speak well is anchored in personal standards of accuracy rather than in the desire for social approval or audience engagement. This aligns with Oxford’s (1990) identification of metacognitive strategies, self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and advance planning, as the dominant strategy cluster for introverted learners: IK’s preparation-centred approach is not simply a personal habit but a theoretically predictable expression of her INTJ profile.

Milne (2020) similarly found that introverted university students consistently scored higher on memory and metacognitive strategy use than their extroverted peers, confirming that this mastery-orientation is a stable feature of introverted language learners rather than an individual idiosyncrasy. The pedagogical implication is significant: IK’s motivational profile can produce outcomes of genuine quality, but only within assessment

conditions that reward depth of preparation, conditions that standard time-pressured, spontaneous-delivery formats may not provide.

MA (ISTP), whose speaking performance was among the strongest of the introverted participants, described a motivational stance of acceptance that functioned almost as a philosophical buffer against performance anxiety. His approach, prepare thoroughly, then release attachment to the outcome, reflects the ISTP's characteristic combination of practical competence and emotional detachment that Jung (1921) associates with the introverted thinking type: a preference for objective engagement over emotional reactivity, applied here to the act of performance itself. Crucially, MA's case also illustrates Pang et al.'s (2024) finding that the relationship between introversion and speaking performance is not linear: highly motivated introverted students can develop communicative repertoires that rival those of extroverted peers, but they do so through different pathways.

In MA's case, disciplined preparation and strategic emotional regulation, what Oxford (1990) classifies as affective strategies, functioned as the decisive variables rather than personality type alone. His case therefore extends the theoretical argument of this study: personality type establishes the motivational tendency, but deliberate strategy use determines whether that tendency becomes a ceiling or a launching point.

AP (ENFJ) illustrated the motivational vulnerability specific to extroverted types in high-stakes assessment contexts. Despite her natural enthusiasm for speaking and her audience orientation, the formal assessment context triggered a performance anxiety that compromised the very fluency her personality would otherwise produce. This paradox,

caring too much about the outcome can undermine the spontaneous energy that makes extroverts strong speakers, speaks to a motivational dynamic that is specific to the intersection of extroversion with high assessment stakes.

The course lecturer's perspective was particularly illuminating on the question of motivation. The observation that MBTI awareness could shift students' self-understanding from global negative judgments ("I am just a bad speaker") to personality-specific, actionable insights ("I am an INFP who tends to speak softly, and I am working on projection") articulates a metacognitive function that the literature directly supports. Milne (2020) found that students who understood their own personality-based learning tendencies were better positioned to select and apply compensatory strategies, precisely the kind of self-directed adjustment that the lecturer describes. This reframing is not merely motivational in a general sense; it operationalizes what Oxford (1990) identifies as affective and metacognitive strategy use, redirecting students' attention from global self-evaluation ("I am bad at speaking") toward specific, modifiable behaviors ("I need to work on projection and eye contact").

Dewi et al. (2020) similarly found that introverted students who received type-informed feedback showed improved self-efficacy in subsequent speaking tasks, suggesting that the lecturer's proposed reframing is not only theoretically sound but empirically grounded. This reframing does not lower expectations; it provides a more accurate and ultimately more empowering account of where a student is and what specific steps they need to take, transforming personality awareness from a label into an actionable pedagogical tool.

3. Speaking Interactions: Audience, Peers, and the Learning Environment

The third dimension of this research question concerns how MBTI type shapes students' interactions during and around speaking activities, with the audience, with peers, and with the broader learning environment.

For extroverted participants, the audience was experienced as a resource. MG (ENFJ) described reading her audience's faces continuously and adjusting her pacing accordingly; VI (ENFP), on her stronger-performing days, similarly demonstrated a communicative style that actively sought audience engagement through clear voice and active participation. This audience orientation is a hallmark of extroverted speaking and contributes significantly to the perceived confidence and fluency that assessors tend to reward.

For introverted participants, audience presence was more frequently experienced as a source of difficulty. NH (ISFP) described performing significantly better in small-group or one-on-one settings, where the reduced audience size allowed her to relax and communicate more naturally. FS (INFP) noted that the energy of the classroom, the collective gaze of many people, could throw her off even when she had prepared thoroughly in private. These accounts suggest that the standard classroom speaking assessment format, individual performance before a full class, creates conditions that inherently disadvantage introverted types, regardless of their actual linguistic competence.

The learning environment dimension also emerged in discussions of peer interaction. Several introverted participants noted that they would welcome more structured opportunities to speak in smaller groups before being asked to perform for the

full class, and that knowing a topic well in advance allowed them to build the familiarity and comfort that extroverted types derive naturally from social engagement. These pedagogical preferences align closely with what the literature on introverted learners predicts and point to specific instructional adjustments that could make speaking practice more equitable and effective.

The course lecturer confirmed that he had observed these environmental preferences among students and expressed interest in incorporating more graduated speaking formats into the course, beginning with small-group presentations and building toward full-class performance over the course of the semester. This graduated approach would allow introverted students to develop confidence incrementally while preserving the authentic public performance demands that the course ultimately requires.

Finally, the lecturer's interview introduced an important cautionary note about the limits of MBTI-informed assessment: the framework should not become an excuse for lower performance expectations or for students to game the system by claiming type-based exemptions. The value of MBTI in the assessment context is contextual and interpretive, it helps educators understand why a student performs the way they do and what kind of support would most help them improve, rather than prescriptive and score-adjusting. This distinction is essential for any future implementation of MBTI-based frameworks in formal speaking assessment.