

MBTI Dichotomies and Speaking Achievement Analysis of English Tadaris Students'

Nabilah Fairuz¹, Mukrim², Aminah Suriaman³

Tadulako University

Corresponding Author: fairuznabilah@gmail.com

Diserahkan: 5 Mei 2026

Diterima: 26 Mei 2026

Diterbitkan: 31 Mei 2026

Abstract

This study investigates whether MBTI dichotomies influence students' speaking achievement and how different MBTI types relate to speaking performance. A mixed-methods approach with an explanatory sequential design was employed. The participants were 29 students from the 2022 cohort of the Tadris English Department at UIN Datokarama Palu, with 8 selected as interview informants through purposive sampling. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS with a One Way ANOVA test. The results revealed no significant differences in speaking achievement across MBTI dichotomies, including extroversion–introversion, sensing–intuition, thinking–feeling, and judging–perceiving. This indicates that MBTI personality types do not significantly affect students' speaking performance in this context. The qualitative findings further support this result, showing that speaking assessment in class is primarily based on students' activeness and the contextual accuracy of their responses rather than personality traits. Students' speaking performance is also influenced by task demands, question context, and classroom participation requirements. Some variations in behavior across MBTI categories were observed; however, these were not consistent enough to indicate a stable influence on achievement. Overall, the study concludes that MBTI dichotomies do not have a significant effect on students' speaking achievement. Instead, performance is shaped more by instructional context and classroom expectations. These findings challenge the assumption that personality type strongly determines language performance and provide implications for English language teaching and educational psychology by emphasizing pedagogical factors over personality classifications.

Keywords: *AI, EFL students, research proposal, writing assistance tools*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji apakah dikotomi MBTI memengaruhi prestasi berbicara siswa serta bagaimana berbagai tipe MBTI berhubungan dengan kinerja berbicara. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan metode campuran dengan desain sekuensial eksplanatori. Partisipan penelitian adalah 29 mahasiswa angkatan 2022 Program Studi Tadris Bahasa Inggris UIN Datokarama Palu, dengan 8 orang dipilih sebagai informan wawancara melalui teknik purposive sampling. Data kuantitatif dianalisis menggunakan SPSS dengan uji One Way ANOVA. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tidak terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan dalam prestasi berbicara berdasarkan dikotomi MBTI, yaitu ekstrovert–introvert, sensing–intuition, thinking–feeling, dan judging–perceiving. Hal ini mengindikasikan bahwa tipe kepribadian MBTI tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa dalam konteks penelitian ini. Temuan kualitatif juga memperkuat hasil tersebut, yang menunjukkan bahwa penilaian kemampuan berbicara di kelas lebih didasarkan pada keaktifan siswa serta ketepatan jawaban sesuai konteks, bukan pada tipe kepribadian. Prestasi berbicara siswa juga dipengaruhi oleh tuntutan tugas, konteks pertanyaan, dan tuntutan partisipasi aktif di kelas. Meskipun terdapat variasi perilaku pada beberapa kategori MBTI, variasi tersebut tidak cukup konsisten untuk menunjukkan adanya pengaruh yang stabil terhadap prestasi. Secara keseluruhan, penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa dikotomi MBTI tidak



memiliki pengaruh signifikan terhadap prestasi berbicara siswa. Sebaliknya, kinerja lebih dipengaruhi oleh konteks pembelajaran dan tuntutan kelas. Temuan ini menantang anggapan bahwa tipe kepribadian menentukan kemampuan berbahasa, serta memberikan implikasi bagi pembelajaran bahasa Inggris dan psikologi pendidikan dengan menekankan faktor pedagogis dibandingkan klasifikasi kepribadian.

Kata Kunci: *MBTI, prestasi berbicara, mixed-method*

INTRODUCTION

In teaching and learning, EFL teachers must design an effective learning design to see whether the students have already accomplished specific goals. By looking at student performance, teachers can see which students have achieved specific goals as their academic achievement. (Goncalves & Rua 2021). It would imply the final result of student performance indicated by students' achievement, which is needed to test the student's understanding by giving an assessment and marks. Moreover, students' achievements are different from each (Murphie, et, al., 2020). The factor of differences in performance in the classroom is one of the massive influencing factors of teacher's assessment for giving scores to students as a sign of their achievement. Various factors can affect differences in learning outcomes, such as age, personality, class size, classroom environment, race, and discipline mixed results (ZiegertAndrea, 2000). Specifically, teachers rarely realize that personality is one factor that influences students' achievement when giving assessments to students (Montequin, et, al., 2012). Furthermore, one of the personality differences results of significant differences in assessment in language learning is speaking skill. This perspective is supported by the argument that speaking skills and personality are intrinsically linked, as students' speaking achievement is shaped by two primary factors: linguistic and non-linguistic factors.. Linguistics factor covers language components such as phonology, syntax, vocabulary, and semantics. While for the non-linguistics factor is psychological factors such as motivation and personality (LeongLai & MasoumehAhmadi, 2017). The statement is in line with Mahripah who stated that various factors affect the EFL learners' speaking skill such as linguistics components and psychological factors such as motivation and personality (LeongLai & MasoumehAhmadi, 2017).

As for the personality, one of the personality categories is known as Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). MBTI is a self-report inventory that was developed to measure the variables in Jung's personality typology (Carlyn, 1977; Myers & Myers, 1995). The personality difference in the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) divides it into sixteen personalities from four dichotomies. The dichotomies are; Extrovert-Introvert, Sensing-Intuiting, Thinking-Feeling, and Judging-Perceiving. Among the various personality classifications within the MBTI framework, several researchers have chosen to focus their studies exclusively on a single dichotomy, namely Extraversion and Introversion. According to Brown (1991) stated in language learning, extroverted ones are smarter than introverts (Lestari et al., 2013). In contrast, research conducted by Adisaputera (2021) shows there is no significant difference in the speaking performance of Extroverted and Introverted students. He further found there is a slight difference in the Fluency of Introverted students (Adisaputera, et al., 2021). Other research conducted by Lestari (2013) also proves that there is no significant difference in speaking performance between Extroverted and Introverted students (Lestari et al., 2013).

Based on researches that has been conducted by Adisaputera's (2021) and Lestari (2013) it shows that there is no significant difference between the pairs of Extroverts and



Introverts in speaking performance without considering the influence of other dichotomies contained in the Myers Briggs Types (Adisaputera, et al., 2021; Lestari et al., 2013). It can be interpreted within the framework of the MBTI personality point of view, the three other dichotomies can influence a person's personality. It is obedient where Isabel Mayers believes that type development may be replaced for intellect because when ordinary intelligence is properly harnessed through fine development, the outcomes will go much beyond expectation (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer 1998). The possibility is the scores obtained by students in class performance of speaking skill have the same results even with different characteristics, which is affected by the other dichotomy of MBTI. Hereafter, some researchers focus just on one of the dichotomies namely Extrovert and Introvert without considering other dichotomies. Moreover, drawing conclusions by looking at one of the dichotomies shows the no difference in the speaking outcomes, thus showing that there are other factors in the student's personality as a support for their achievement in speaking.

Relating to the problem the researches see the main problem covers several dichotomies in MBTI which have to become a consideration in decision-making regarding the influence of personality on speaking achievement. In practice, the researcher wants to prove that the influence of student achievement in speaking class which is only based on the assumption of personality differences between Extrovert and Introverts results of 'no difference in speaking performance' can also be a weighing factor for the teacher's assessment that there are some aspects of other dichotomies that influence speaking outcomes that come out to be no significant difference. Contingent upon the problem the researcher aims to find out the influence of other dichotomies of MBI on students' speaking achievement, where some researches see the influence of students' personality on students' speaking achievement only in one pair of MBTI. Moreover, it is also conducted to prove Jung's theory of personality in the educational field MBTI pairs also affects students' achievement, specifically in speaking. In practice the researcher also wants to prove the influence of student achievement in speaking class which is only based on the assumption of personality differences between Extrovert and Introverts results of 'no difference in speaking performance' can also be a weighing factor for the teacher's assessment that there are some aspects of other dichotomies that influence speaking outcomes. The research is focused on the MBTI classification analysis towards students' achievement and MBTI Dichotomies and speaking achievement. Personality analysis is carried out to prove others part dichotomy influence in speaking class which affected students' speaking achievement. Moreover, the research is more focused on personality test by the MBTI which each dichotomy will be analyzed by synchronizing each dichotomy with the part of speaking achievement.

In the same regard, this research looked at whether EFL learners at Datokarama Islamic University in language learning also showed a significant differences in speaking skills or not. Seeing the significant difference of given score/mark in speaking class is based on student performance in class. Based on the problem, the researcher sees that the findings of "no difference in the achievement of Extrovert and Introvert students in speaking performance" was not influenced by the Extrovert and Introvert aspect only, but also the left pairs included in the MBTI such as Intuition-Sensing, Thinking-Feeling, and Judging-Perceiving had part on the influence of speaking achievement.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research design used by the researcher was a mixed-method approach. By specific design the QUAN core - Qual supplemental model was an explanatory sequential design. The quantitative data collected by the researcher through questionnaire for MBTI data and document for students' scores data in speaking class (students' students' speaking score from the lecture). The use of qualitative data is to underpin the result of a quantitative survey that already performed. Meanwhile, the qualitative data collected by the researcher through observation, interview and document. Furthermore, the data analyzed by the researcher by using the SPSS with the One Way ANOVA test and the triangulation technique. The triangulation was used to draw the conclusion by triangulating three data: observation, In-depth Interview, and Documentation.

Moreover, the researcher carried out mixed data analysis, including the division of student Speaking Achievement data that has been analyzed based on the division of student MBTI dichotomy (Quantitative data). Furthermore, the researcher included the analysis of student observation and interview (Qualitative data) from the triangulation as a supporting argument for the analysis of previous data results. The mixed-methods data analysis was conducted by comparing the results of students' MBTI personality classifications obtained from both quantitative and qualitative data sources. The findings were subsequently compared with the students' speaking achievement scores to determine whether differences in MBTI personality types were associated with variations in speaking performance. Furthermore, the comparison was used to examine the extent to which personality characteristics, as reflected in the MBTI profiles, influenced students' speaking achievement. To strengthen and validate the findings, semi-structured interviews were conducted to explore how students perceived, experienced, and managed various situations and their attitude toward encountered in speaking classes. The interview data provided deeper insights into the quantitative results and served as a means of triangulation, offering a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between MBTI personality types and speaking achievement.

The sampling technique used by the researcher was non-probability sampling; purposive sampling. The sample of the research were sophomore students of the English Tadris program in TBI 1 and TBI 2 in the fourth-semester class of 2022. The sample was fourteen students of TBI 1 and fifteen students of TBI 2 where eight of whom were informants for the interview. For the quantitative data, the questionnaire was analyzed by testing the validity and reliability by the SPSS application. After gather the MBTI type of students', the speaking achievement was analyzed by put student grade according to the categories of student personality division and found the mean value of each category. Moreover, the search for the mean value of students the researcher used SPSS. Specifically, a descriptive statistics were used to describe the results.

Moreover, for the qualitative data, the observation used passive participation observation, where the researcher was limited to observing behavior and was not involved in activities. The objects that the researcher observed were students who had taken the MBTI test, where these objects were taken also as informants. Wherefore, the object fulfilled the three components of the research object, namely Place (UIN Datokarama; TBI Classes), Actor (TBI 1 and 2 Students), and Activities (Speaking Class). Furthermore, for the interview the researcher used in-depth interview is conducted to find out more deeply things from informants. The interview technique used by the researcher was semi-open questions. The informant chosen certain students, considering that they met the criteria expected of the researcher. Moreover, the criteria required by the researcher were:



Informant has done MBTI test, Informant is an English student, Informant has taken speaking class, and Informant tells the truth and nothing but the truth.

FINDINGS

The research findings are based on a diverse range of data collected and analyzed by the researcher. The MBTI questionnaire was distributed to students of TBI 1 and 2, and observation data, interview data, and documents in the form of students' speaking scores were also collected. The researcher then proceeded to analyze this data, leading to the results described beneath.

Data Description of MBTI Dichotomies and Speaking Scores

The data description contained the results of data analysis based on each dichotomy of MBTI and speaking scores. As for the data description in the analysis of speaking scores and part of each MBTI dichotomy based on SPSS 20 descriptive analysis. Thus, from Tabel 1 descriptively, the highest average speaking score is the Judging type, with an average of 84.66. Moreover, the most MBTI items are Thinking and Judging with a total of 17 students. Moreover, the descriptive statistics revealed that there were no substantial differences among the mean scores of the individual items.

Table 1 SPSS Descriptive Analysis Output

Descriptives				
Speaking Achievement				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Extrovert	15	82.3333	9.14695	2.36173
Introvert	14	83.3571	6.46419	1.72763
Sensing	16	82.5625	8.67155	2.16789
Intuiting	13	83.1538	7.02194	1.94754
Thinking	17	83.5294	7.52594	1.82531
Feeling	12	81.8333	8.50490	2.45515
Judging	17	84.3529	7.49951	1.81890
Perceiving	12	80.6667	8.12777	2.34628
Total	116	82.8276	7.73954	.71860

One Way ANOVA Test Result

The ANOVA test was carried out by the researcher to draw a research conclusion where the significance value obtained in this test was used as the basis for the hypothesis test. Therefore, before the test is carried out, the researcher must fulfill two test requirements: the data must have a normal distribution and be homogeneous. Moreover, in this research, the researcher obtained the results that the data obtained was normally distributed and homogeneous.

Table 2 One Way ANOVA Result

ANOVA					
Speaking Achievement					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	125.923	7	17.989	.287	.958
Within Groups	6762.628	108	62.617		
Total	6888.552	115			

Based on the ANOVA test, the probability value (Sig) is 0.958, and the significance level value α is 0.05. So, comparing the probability value (Sig) with the significance level (α), if the probability (Sig) $> \alpha$, then H_0 is accepted. Therefore, If it is compared, it turns out that $\text{Sig} = 0.958 > \alpha = 0.05$, then H_0 is rejected. On a final note, the conclusion is; "There is no difference in average scores in students' speaking achievement between the extrovert–introvert, sensing–intuiting, thinking–feeling, and judging–perceiving." Hence the researcher withdrew that the hypothesis which is purposed, namely "There is a difference in students speaking achievement of each MBTI dichotomy," was rejected. It was rejected due to the value got by the researcher indicates that the average score of each dichotomy was almost the same or no significant difference.

MBTI Comparison of Three Data

This part contain data combined from student MBTI data in a questionnaire, observation, interview and document that compare students' speaking achievement and student MBTI from each of the results of data analysis from the eight participants. In Table3, the researcher presents the students' MBTI type based on the results of processing the three data by dividing the document containing the participants' scores by the marks.

Table 3 MBTI Comparison of Three Data

No	Respo- ndent	Interview MBTI	Observation MBTI	Questionnaire MBTI	Grade	Mark
St.01.	KHN	ENTJ	ENTJ	ESTJ	90	A
St.02.	BRM	ESTJ	ENFJ	ENFP	90	A
St.03.	RVA	ISFP	INFJ	ISTJ	90	A
St.04.	ELV	ESTJ	ISTP	ISTP	79	B+
St.05.	IRM	ENTJ	ENTP	ENTJ	84	A-
St.06.	LDA	INTJ	INTJ	INTJ	79	B+
St.07.	SRG	ISTP	ISTP	ISFP	69	B-
St.08.	DWS	ESFP	ESFP	ESFP	87	A

Therefore, from the three data sets, students' MBTI type can change based on the situation, demands in speaking class performance, and the desire to achieve a good speaking score.

DISCUSSION

Based on the results of questionnaire data processing to determine students' MBTI, the most common MBTI item is the "Judging type". In addition, based on the division of MBTI types, the highest speaking scores were for students with the MBTI Judging item. Furthermore, based Therefore, from the hypothesis test, which resulted in the intended hypothesis being rejected, it was concluded that there was no difference between each dichotomy in students' speaking achievement. Furthermore, in this research, the researchers found no influence of personality on speaking achievement based on the MBTI division. It indicated that by looking at the differences in students' speaking scores based on the division of each dichotomy of MBTI, the results obtained are the same, which is no difference. It means in this research, each pair of MBTI has no influence respectively on the differences in students' speaking achievement.

Hence, that the MBTI dichotomies do not influence students' speaking achievement. It is based on the student's performance in the speaking class; the student's personality changes according to the demands and conditions in the class, which changes



because students are required to be active because the student's performance in the class is the substance for the teacher's assessment. Moreover, the researcher also found that the suitability of answers in student performance in speaking class was not only based on the student's point of view in answering but also on the way they behaved and thought in each dichotomy. It is shown that students answering based on each dichotomy way of thinking does not influence the speaking assessment as long as the students are active in class, respond to questions well, can answer according to the context, and follow the components of the speaking assessment.

Moreover, concerning MBTI personality and students' achievement based on the results of data analysis, in relation to the no difference on each item of MBTI dichotomies is related to the results where the MBTI dichotomies do not influence students' speaking achievement. Due to the fact that, there are other factors that affecting students' speaking achievement. The factors are where the student's performance in the speaking class the student's personality adapts to the demands of the goals in the speaking subject, the precision of answers based on context, and the speaking assessment focuses more on student activity in class.

CONCLUSION

The results of quantitative and qualitative data analysis as an answer to the objectives of the research "To prove whether there is a difference between the extrovert–introvert, sensing–intuiting, thinking–feeling, and judging–perceiving in students' speaking achievement", and "To find out how does the variety of the MBTI dichotomies influence students' speaking achievement", the researcher concludes that there was no difference in the students' speaking score based on the MBTI dichotomy division. Furthermore, the variety of MBTI dichotomy does not influence students speaking achievement. The no difference and no influence in students' speaking scores which was not solely influenced by the student's personality because, in the performance of speaking class, the student's personality could change. This is proven by the differences and changes in students' MBTI types based on the analysis of the three data sets. Moreover, there are several factor that affecting the changes are; student's personality adapts to the demands of the goals in the speaking subject, the precision of answers based on context, and the speaking assessment focuses more on student activity in class. By the research, the researcher indicate the research can help lecture provide detailed assessments based on students' multiple characteristics such as adding notes/feedback (e.g. Give more rational answers in class) in assessing students, so students' can improve their speaking skills.

REFERENCES

- Adisaputera, A., Khazin, M, K., Siregar, M., Sanjaya, D., & Meisuri. (2021). The Impact of Personality (Extrovert/Introvert) on University Learners' Speaking Achievement. *Asian EFL Journal Vol. 28 Issue No.2.2*, 157-173. DOI: 10.1111/fcre.12566
- Ayoubi, M. R., & Ustwani, B. (2014). The Relationship between Student's MBTI, Preferences and Academic Performance at a Syrian University. *Education and Training*, 78-90. DOI: 10.1108/ET-09-2012-0090
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Prentice Hall: Regents.

- Carlyn, M. (1977). An Assessment of the Myers-Briggs type Indicator. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 461-473. DOI: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4105_2
- Ciorbea, I., & Florentina, P. (2013). The Study of the Relationship between Personality and Academic Performance. *Elsevier: Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 400-404. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.319>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Designing and Conducting Mix Methods Research*. USA: SAGE.
- Dewi, S. D., Siahaan, S., & Putri, N. N. (2020). The Correlation Between Students' Personality and Students' Speaking Skill. *ANGLO-SAXON: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 289-299. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33373/as.v11i2>
- Giada, A., Giovanni, B., & Viceza, C. (2014). A new Indicator for Higer Education Student Performance. *Higher Education*, 653-668. DOI: 10.1007/s10734-014-9737-x.
- Goncalves, C., & Rua, O, L. (2021). Learning Creativity and Student's Performace: An Empirical Study from Portugal. *E-Revista de Estudos Interculturais*.
- Jach, H. K., Bardach, L., & Murayama, K. (2023). How Personality Matters for Education Research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 1-27. DOI: 10.1007/s10648-023-09807-4
- Kember, D. (2016). *Understanding the Nature of Motivation and Motivating Students through Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. Australia: Springer.
- Kim, M. R., & Han, S. J. (2014). Relationships between the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Personality Profiling, Academic Performance and Student Satisfaction in Nursing Students. *International Journal of Bio-Science and Bio-Technology*, 1-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14257/ijbsbt.2014.6.6.01>
- Leong, L. M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 34-41. DOI: 10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.1.34
- Lestari, A., Clarry, S., & Suhartono, L. (2013). Analysis on the Relationship of Extrovert-Introvert Personality and Students' Speaking Performance. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 1-14. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v4i3.9232>
- Mairi, S. (2017). An Analysis of Speaking Fluency Level of the English Department Students of Universitas Negeri Padang (UNP). *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 161. DOI: 10.24036/ld.v10i2.7417
- Montequin, R. V., Fernandes. M. M. J., Balsera, V. J., & Nieto, G. A. (2013). Using MBTI for the success assessment of engineering teams in project-based learning. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 1127-1146. DOI: 10.1007/s10798-012-9229-1
- Murphie, L., Eduljee, N. B., Croteau, K., & Suzane, P. (2020). Relationship between Personality Type and Preferred Teaching Methods for Undergraduate College Students. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 100-109. DOI: 10.46328/ijres.v6i1.690
- Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts Differing - Understanding Personality Type - Isabel Briggs Myers*. California: Davies-Black Publishing.
- Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. California: Consulting Psychology Press.



- Nguyen, L. T., Hung, B. P., Duong, U. T., & Le, T. T. (2021). Teachers' and Learners' Beliefs About Pronunciation Instruction in Tertiary English as a Foreign Language Education. *Frontiers in Psychology*. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.739842
- Nuby, J. F., & Rebecca, L. (1996). Learning Style Preferences of Native American and African-American Secondary Students as Measured by the MBTI. *Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association*, 1-23.
- Sari, D., Yuliasesti, E. B., & Khoiruddin. (2020). Predicting managerial styles: Is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator still useful? *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 617-622. DOI: 10.11591/edulearn.v14i4.14582
- Wang, H., Liu, Y., Wang, Z., & Wang, T. (2023). The Influences of the Big Five Personality Traits on Academic Achievements: Chain Mediating Effect based on Major Identity and Self-Efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1-21. DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1065554](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1065554)
- Wilde, D. J. (2011). *Jung's Personality Theory Quantified*. London: Springer.
- Ziegret, A. L. (2009). Research in Economic Education Personality Learning of Evidence. *The Journal of Economic Education*, 307-322. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1183145>