ELT Echo : The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context

journal homepage: https://syekhnurjati.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/eltecho

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SPEAKING SKILLS BETWEEN STUDENTS' WITH HIGH AND LOW LEVELS OF NEUROTICISM

Deswita Aulia Maharani, Desi Surlitasari Dewi[*], Adam Adam

[*]Corresponding author: Pahlawan Street, Batu Aji, Kota Batam, Kepulauan Riau, 29425, Indonesia. Email addresses : desisurlitasari@gmail.com

article info	abstract
	This study investigated the differences in speaking skills between students with high and low levels of neuroticism using a sequential explanatory mixed methods design with comparative approach. The research involved 41 senior high school students from SMA Muhammadiyah Batam who completed neuroticism assessments using adapted NEO-FFI questionnaire and speaking performance tests. Quantitative analysis through Independent Sample T-Test revealed statistically significant differences ($p < 0.001$) in speaking scores between high and low neuroticism groups, with low neuroticism students achieving higher performance. Qualitative interviews with selected participants were analyzed using thematic analysis, revealing three main themes: speaking anxiety, coping strategies, and motivation and learning attitudes. While low neuroticism students employed a variety of informal methods of learning and reacted positively to feedback, high neuroticism students showed more speaking anxiety, employed less efficient methods of preparation, and had more self-doubt. These results have practical implications for EFL teacher and advance our understanding of the links between personality and language learning within the Big Five framework. The findings highlight how crucial it is to take individual personality characteristics into consideration when creating speaking curriculum and putting classroom strategies into practice in order to maximize learning outcomes for each individuals.

INTRODUCTION

Speaking activity is an essential part of human life because it is able to facilitate communication, the expression of ideas, messages, feelings, and other things in various emotional conditions (Dahlia, Intiana, & Husniati, 2023). It is similar with speaking is one of productive skill that asks someone to combine their ideas, feeling and transfer message to others (Wulandari, 2024). In line with this, Mantra and Maba (2018) defined speaking as the the ability to pronounce articulation sounds or words to express and convey thoughts, ideas and feelings. Speaking, in general, can be interpreted as conveying one's intentions to others by using spoken language so that others can understand these intentions.

Speaking skills represent a persistent challenge in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms globally, with students usually struggle with fear, reduced fluency, and reluctance to engage in oral activities (Hanifa, 2018). According to Alvarez et al. (2024) and Alrasheedi (2020), EFL students still face major psychological obstacles when speaking, such as lack of confidence with their language skills, fear of making mistake, and worry about peer criticism. Beside impact academic performance, speaking difficulties also limit students' future professional opportunities in an increasingly digitalized world (Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020).

However, in practice, students usually have difficulties when engaging in English-speaking activities. When asked to speak in front of their peers, some students easily feel nervous, lack of vocabulary , and feel low confidence in term of structure, pronunciation, and intonation

(Putri, Jaya, & Marleni, 2023). This, in the end fail them to speak up their ideas or thoughts, even though they may have practised for many times before standing up in front of the audiences. There are also some students who are able to speak up their mind regardless the mistake they may make. The students just speak in English confidently, even with grammatical errors and lack of vocabulary knowledge. It indicates that they found speaking enjoyable and were able to speak more comfortably due to their high level of confidence (Dewi, Siahaan, & Putri, 2020).

Researchers have looked into a number of contributing elements due to the complexity of speaking anxiety in EFL contexts, and personality traits have emerged as particularly significant predictors of speaking performance and communication willingness (Dewaele & Al-Saraj, 2015). Similarly, Karim et al. (2016) also found that one of the most important factors influencing speaking performance is personality. Therefore, personality contributes to the learners' learning process. Each student reacts differently to the same assignment, as evidenced by these disparate responses, which may be affected by their unique personalities.

The Big Five Model is one of the psychological frameworks that has received the most attention due to its thorough approach to comprehending individual variations in educational contexts (Costa & Mccrae, 1992; John & Srivastava, 1999). Within this framework, neuroticism, which is typified by negative affectivity, anxiety proneness, and emotional instability, has shown a strong correlation with language acquisition results (Dawaele, Magdalena, & Saito, 2019). According to Ożańska-Ponikwia et al. (2020) individuals with high levels of neuroticism tend to be more sensitive to stress, more susceptible to anxiety, inducing circumstances, and more likely to experience negative emotional reactions. These traits can significantly affect their willingness and capacity to participate in oral communication activities. Considering that performance anxiety and the fear of receiving a low score are still prevalent concerns among students in EFL speaking contexts, this personality trait seems particularly relevant (Alrasheedi, 2020; Hanifa, 2018).

Ożańska-Ponikwia et al. (2020) noted that neuroticism affects language acquisition through a number of mechanisms, such as motivational elements, anxiety control, and cognitive processing effectiveness. Ebrahimi et al. (2018) highlight that High levels of anxiety, which are frequently linked to neurotic tendencies, can impede language learning by erecting emotional barriers to input processing and output production. Additionally, neurotic people frequently have perfectionist tendencies and high levels of self-awareness, which can limit their willingness to take chances when using language, particularly in high-risk speaking settings (Gragersen & Horwitz, 2010). Despite conflicting and context-dependent empirical evidence, this theoretical viewpoint contends that neuroticism can be an insightful indicator of speaking ability.

Prior studies on neuroticism and second language proficiency have yielded contradictory results in different circumstances and populations. Numerous recent studies have shown that neuroticism and speaking performance are negatively correlated, with neurotic learners demonstrating decreased fluency, increased anxiety, and decreased speaking ability generally. Roslan et al. (2018) found that Speaking tasks might cause stress or anxiety in neurotic individuals. However, neuroticism is more likely to be linked to anxiety, emotional instability, and unfavorable stress effects (Paulus, Vanwoerden, Norton, & Sharp, 2016). This can lead to high academic pressure and a lack of commitment to learning English as a foreign language (Cao & Meng, 2020). According to Chen et al. (2021), among the five dimensions of the Big Five personality traits, neuroticism has the weakest correlation with English as a foreign language (EFL) learning achievement and makes people to be less prepared to acquire a second language.

On the other hand, other research has found an insignificant or positive correlation between speaking ability and neuroticism. According to Ebrahimi et al. (2018), emotional intelligence is one mediating or moderating element that can lessen the negative effects of neuroticism on speaking skills. Putri et al. (2023) observed that Indonesian EFL students with neuroticism tendencies use more intensive practice strategies, indicating that anxiety could serve as a motivating element in specific learning environments. These results suggest that even though students with high levels of neuroticism might feel more nervous when speaking, they usually use affective strategies which may partly explain the significant differences observed in speaking performance between students with high and low levels of neuroticism in this study.

By exploring contextual elements that may influence the correlation between neuroticism and speaking performance, cross-cultural research has further complicated this relationship. Dewaele and Al-Saraj (2015) in a study with Arab EFL students discovered that the way neuroticism impacted speaking anxiety in various educational contexts was significantly affected by classroom culture and teacher feedback style. However, Astuti and Lammers (2017) indicates that when given a supportive classroom setting and organized feedback systems, neurotic learners frequently exhibit greater confidence while speaking. Furthermore, cultural dimensions in the expression of anxiety appear to influence how neuroticism manifests in different educational contexts (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2016).

The relationship between neuroticism and speaking skills has also taken on new dimensions as an outcome of recent technological advancements. According to Gasc et al. (2020), compared to traditional face-to-face learning, neurotic learners frequently display different types of engagement and performance. Since many EFL learners have experienced higher speaking anxiety as a result of the virtual learning environment, the COVID-19 pandemic has brought these variances to forefront. Neurotic learner have shown various patterns of adaptability (Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020).

Inconsistent results could also be explained by methodological variations among prior studies. While some studies use extensive performance assessments that include measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994), others rely on self-reported measures of speaking ability (Ożańska-Ponikwia, Piechurska-Kuciel, & Skałacka, 2020). Furthermore, there are considerable differences in how neuroticism is analyzed, some research use short personality tests, while others use extensive Big Five evaluations (Horwitz, 2001). The present dispute over the significance of neuroticism in speaking performance in English as a foreign language (EFL) is a result of these methodological variations as well as differing sample characteristics and cultural contexts.

Although extensive study has been conducted on personality and language learning, there are still several critical gaps in our understanding of how neuroticism affects speaking skills in English as a foreign language (EFL). Most previous studies have focused on Western, East Asian, or Middle Eastern contexts, with little investigation into the EFL environment in Southeast Asia especially Indonesia, where English functions primarily as a foreign language rather than a second language. Futhermore, few studies like Roslan et al. (2018) have specifically investigated the quantitative differences in speaking scores between high and low neuroticism groups, with most research focusing on correlational relationships rather than comparative performance analysis.

This study is crucial because it is becoming increasingly clear that individual learner differences must be taken into consideration in EFL instruction, especially when it comes to the development of speaking skills, where psychological variables are important (Alrasheedi, 2020; Alvarez et al., 2024; Hanifa, 2018). Understanding how personality variables affect speaking performance is crucial for creating inclusive and successful pedagogical approaches, as

Indonesian educational policies place a greater emphasis on communicative competence and emotional intelligence in language learning (Marpaung & Widyantoro, 2020). Additionally, because of the COVID-19 pandemic's increased dependence on virtual learning platforms and decreased possibilities for in-person engagement, speaking anxiety among EFL learners has increased, underscoring the importance of personality-informed instruction (Atmojo & Nugroho, 2020; Gacs, et al., 2020).

To address these gaps, the current study investigate speaking skill differences between Indonesian EFL students with high and low neuroticism levels focusing on the Indonesian EFL environment, where formal instruction is the main method used to teach English and naturalistic exposure is limited. Therefore, the research question guiding this study is, "Is there a significant difference in speaking skills between students with high and low levels of neuroticism?" and "How do speaking skills differ between students with high and low levels of neuroticism?".

METHOD

A sequential explanatory mixed-methods design was used in this study to thoroughly investigate the connection between neuroticism levels and EFL speaking skills. Sequential explanatory design allows researchers to first collect and analyze quantitative data, followed by qualitative data collection to provide deeper explanations of the quantitative findings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This approach was chosen because it integrates rich, contextual insights from student experiences with statistical evidence to provide a broader view of how personality traits affect speaking abilities. In order to investigate the differences between the groups with high and low neuroticism, a comparative method was intergrated into this design.

Participants in this study were 41 student of senior high school in Batam, Indonesia. researcher used a non-probability sampling technique with purposive sampling, considering that the class was approachable, cooperative, and represented the average level of students in the school. Student between the ages of 16 to 17 years who had been learning English as a foreign language for a minimum of six years were included in the sample. To classify participants into high and low neuroticism group, students' scores from the neuroticism scale of the adapted questionnaire from the NEO-FFI were calculated. Those who scored above the median were classified as the high neuroticism group, while those who scored below the median were classified as the low neuroticism group.

Three primary instruments were used for collecting the data. First, tudents were required to give a five to seven minute speech on a given prompt as part of an oral exam that was used to evaluate their speaking abilities. Brown's (2004) oral proficiency scoring rubric, which evaluates pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension across five proficiency levels, was used for assessing students' speaking skills. Second, a modified version of the neuroticism subscale of the NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) was used to gauge neuroticism levels (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Eleven valid items on a four-point Likert scale made up the questionnaire, and Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.874$) verified its reliability. Third, eight students, four from the low neuroticism group and four from the high neuroticism group, were purposefully chosen to take part in semi-structured interviews. This stage attempted to discover further about the students' personal experiences with speaking assignments, including their emotions, challenges, and coping mechanisms.

Data collection proceeded in two sequential phases. In the quantitative phase, Data collection proceeded in two sequential phases. In the quantitative phase, all participants completed the neuroticism questionnaire via google form, followed by individual speaking performance

assessments conducted in classroom settings. In the qualitative phase, Selected participants were interviewed in a semi-structured manner in order to gain deeper about their speaking experiences and the mechanisms that underlie the quantitative results.

Quantitative data analysis was performed using SPSS 27.0. The shapiro-wilk test was used to assess data normality, and the levene test was used to assess variance homogeneity before hypothesis testing. The independent samples t-test was used to compare speaking performance between high and low levels neuroticism.

Qualitative data from interviews were analyzed using inductive thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework. In order to completely comprehend the data, the researchers first took note of recurrent ideas and observations while closely reading and rereading the transcripts. Subsequently, the transcripts were categorized using the students' own words rather than using predetermined categories. Initial codes included topics like "afraid of making mistakes," "nervous before speaking," and "feeling more confident after practicing."

Next, the codes were grouped into broader categories to identify potential themes that reflected patterns across the data. For instance, codes such as "nervous before speaking" and "afraid of mistakes" were clustered under the theme Speaking Anxiety, while codes like "confidence in delivering ideas" and "willingness to participate" were grouped under the theme Confidence and Engagement. The themes were then reviewed and refined to ensure they accurately represented the data and aligned with the research questions.

Each theme was clearly defined to capture its core meaning. For example, the theme Speaking Anxiety illustrated students' emotional struggles before and during speaking activities, while Confidence and Engagement reflected their ability to overcome nervousness and actively participate. Finally, the themes were supported by direct quotations from the interview transcripts, which provided rich and illustrative examples of students' perspectives, ensuring that the analysis remained grounded in the data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results are provided in two stages: first, the quantitative results analyze statistical differences across groups; second, the qualitative results use thematic analysis of participant experiences to provide deeper insights of the quantitative outcomes. Table 1 shows the frequency analysis of the neuroticism level.

Table 1. Demographic Information of Respondent's Neroticims Level

Level	N	Precentage
High Neuroticism	22	53.7%
Low Neuroticism	19	46.3%

After spreading 11 items of adapted questionnaire from NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) to the sample, the results showed that there were 22 students were categorized as having low neuroticism with a percentage of 53.7%. Conversely, there are 19 students were categorized as having high neuroticism with a percentage of 46.3%. The distribution of 41 participants was nearly equal between the high and low neuroticism groups.

After the individuals were split into high and low neuroticism groups according to their questionnaire scores. Descriptive statistics, such as means, standard deviations, and ranges, were calculated separately for each group as indicated in table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation

155

High Neuroticism	22	40	90	59.09	11.612
Low Neuroticism	19	60	95	74.47	10.788
Valid N (listwise)	19				

With a mean speaking score of 59.09 (SD = 11.612), students with high neuroticism levels performed worse than those with low neuroticism levels, who performed better with a mean score of 74.47 (SD=10.788). Students with low levels of neuroticism performed significantly better on the speaking task than their peers with high levels of neuroticism, as evidenced by the mean difference of 15.38 points between the groups.

Next step is to examine whether the speaking score data in each group meets the assumption of normality. This test needs to be conducted to determine the appropriate statistical analysis to be applied in comparing the speaking performance between students with low and high levels of neuroticism. The results of the Shapiro Wilk normality test are shown in table 3.

Table 3. Normality Test (Shapiro Wilk)

		Statistic	df	Sig.
Speaking Score	High Neuroticism	.953	22	.365
	Low Neuroticism	.935	19	.216

The results show that the significance value for the low neuroticism is 0.216 > 0.05, and the significance value for the High Neuroticism is 0.365 > 0.05. Since both significance values are greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the speaking score data for both groups is normally distributed. Therefore, the appropriate statistical test used in this study is the parametric test, specifically the independent sample t-test. This test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in speaking scores between students with high and low levels of neuroticism.

Table 4. Independent Sample t-Test

Statistics	Value
t-Value	-4.370
Dregrees of Freedom (df)	39
Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001
Mean Difference	-15.383
Std.Error Difference	3.520
95% Confidence Interval	-22,530 to -8,263

The results indicate that the significant difference was found in speaking skills between students with high and low levels of neuroticism. The analysis revealed a t-value of -4.370 with degrees of freedom (df) = 39 and a significance level of $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed), which is well below the alpha level of 0.05. The mean difference of -15.383 with a standard error difference of 3.520 indicates that students with low levels of neuroticism achieved higher speaking scores compared to students with high levels of neuroticism. The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference ranges from -22.530 to -8.263, thereby confirming a statistically significant difference. These findings indicate that the null hypothesis is rejected, and it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in speaking skills between students with high and low levels of neuroticism.

Following the quantitative data analysis, a thorough thematic analysis of the interview transcripts identified three main themes that explained the mechanisms underlying the differences in quantitative performance.

Theme 1: Speaking Anxiety
The primary subject that distinguished individuals who have high and low levels of neuroticism was speaking anxiety. This theme covered the physiological and emotional responses that students had both before and during speaking assignments, which had a big impact on the way they performed. Table 5 shows the coding framework on the theme of speech anxiety.

Table 5. Coding Framework of Speaking Anxiety

Theme	Sub-Theme	Code	Sub-Code	Respond
Speaking Anxiety	Physiological Responses	Nervous before speaking	Physical reactions	"Yes, I feel a bit nervous and also anxious."
		Nervousness affects fluency	Speech disruption	"Yes, it affects me a little because my speech becomes stuttered."
	Social Anxiety	Fear of being observed	Peer observation anxiety	"I am being nerveous because my friends are watching."
	Performance Concerns	Fear of making mistakes	Error apprehension	"Afraid of speaking incorrectly, it affects my performance."
		Nervous due to lack of preparation	Preparation anxiety	"Preparation is usually at school, so I feel nervous."
	Physical Manifestations	Freezing and unstable voice	Motor disruption	"When I forget, I freeze and my voice becomes inconsistent."

Although both groups felt some level of anxiety throughout the speaking assignment, students with high levels of neuroticism were significantly more inclined to experience speaking anxiety. R1 state; *"Afraid of speaking incorrectly, it affects my performance,"* it was the primary focus of their anxiety of making mistakes. According to R3, this nervousness took on more incapacitating forms: *"When I forget, I freeze and my voice becomes inconsistent,"* which was also brought on by their lack of preparation. High neuroticism participants displayed more severe somatic symptoms and cognitive deficits that seriously hampered their confidence and fluency.

On the other hand, students with low levels of neuroticism described controllable anxiety reactions, where R8 stated: *"Yes, I feel a bit nervous and also anxious".* it indicates that instead of being pervasive and debilitating, their anxiety seemed temporarily and controllable. They were able to control their emotions well and continue their presentation despite experiencing discomfort at the beginning.

Theme 2: Learning Strategies
The second theme revealed marked variations in the ways that students prepared for speaking assignments. Students' informal and formal learning preferences to prepare for improving their speaking skills were both covered under this theme.

Table 6. Coding Framework of Leaning Strategies

Theme	Sub-Theme	Code	Sub-Code	Respond
Leaning Strategies	Surface-level Strategies	Minimal preparation	Last-minute preparation	"My preparation is just re-reading, only 5-10 minutes."
	Media-based Learning	Learning through entertainment	Multimedia exposure	"I like to learning from songs, movies, streamers, or podcast, it really helps improve my English speaking skills."

	Prefers visual learning methods	Visual comprehension	"I prefer learning through videos, so I understand better visually."
Dependent Learning Approach	Conditional motivation	External dependency	"I like English when I understand the teacher's explanation."

The second theme revealed marked variations in the ways that students prepared for speaking assignments. Students' informal and formal learning preferences to prepare for improving their speaking skills were both covered under this theme.

Interestingly, despite having very different general learning styles, both groups employed similar methods for preparation. Minimum formal preparation was described by participants with low neuroticism, R6: *"My preparation is just re-reading, only 5-10 minutes"*. However, they displayed a wider variety of personal informal learning methods, as R8: *"I like to learning from songs, movies, streamers, or podcast, it really helps improve my English speaking skills."* This indicates that even though their formal preparation was limited, students with low neuroticism were actively seeking out various learning opportunities through social media.

On the other hand, students with high levels of neuroticism demonstrated a stronger reliance on teacher-driven, structured learning strategies in a class setting. R2 expressed conditional engagement; *"I like English when I understand the teacher's explanation,"* it suggesting that their motivation is more dependent on external factors.

Both groups additionally displayed a preference for visual learning strategies. On the other hand, individuals with lower neuroticism scores shown more initiative for self-directed learning outside of the classroom.

Theme 3: Motivation and Learning Attitudes

The third theme focuses on how students utilize support systems, maintained motivation, and respond to feedback in order to improve their EFL speaking skills.

Table 7. Coding Framework of Motivation and Learning Attitudes

Theme	Sub-Theme	Code	Sub-Code	Respond
Motivation and Learning Attitudes	Positive Feedback Reception	Correction seen as positive	Constructive interpretation	"I like my teacher to correct me if I make a mistake in my speaking performance, it means the teacher is really paying attention."
		Asking teacher for help	Seeking proactive support	"When having difficulties, I usually ask teacher to help me."
	Peer Acceptance	Resilience despite discouragement	Self Motivation	"When I feel hopeless, I will think everything is okay, just try again."
		No insecurity with peers	Social comfort	"I do not feel insecure with friends who speak better than me."
	Active Coping	Using coping strategies	Self regulation techniques	"If I forget what vocabulary I should say next, I usually distract myself by looking for another word. I am embarrassed, actually, but I am just confident."

Participants' responses to challenges and feedback varied, highlighting significant differences between students with high and low levels of neuroticism. Positive attitudes toward feedback and correction were regularly displayed by those with low neuroticism as R7 stated: *"I like my teacher to correct me if I make a mistake in my speaking performance, it means the teacher is really paying attention."* They interpreted teacher's correction as an indication of attention rather than criticism.

Most extraordinary, when faced with disappointment, those with low levels of neuroticism demonstrated exceptional resilience and insightful coping strategies as R5 stated: *"When I feel hopeless, I will think everything is okay, just try again."* They certainly require emotional control and a growth attitude to remain encouraged to learn even in the face of short-term challenges.

Conversely, students with high level neuroticism displayed more complex responses. Their confidence were occasionally more brittle and contradictory, despite the fact that they showed some active coping mechanisms. Additionally, compared to those with low levels of neuroticism, they demonstrated a greater reliance on external support, as R4 stated: *"When having difficulties, I usually ask teacher to help me,"* indicating a lack of independent coping abilities.

This study examined the differences in students' speaking skills between students with high and low levels of neuroticism. The quantitative findings revealed a statistically significant difference between the two groups, suggesting that neuroticism is an important factor influencing students' speaking performance in the EFL context. These results contribute to the growing body of literature on the relationship between personality traits and EFL learning achievement, specifically in relation to the Big Five model.

According to these results, which are consistent with earlier research, students who exhibit high levels of neuroticism are more likely to experience nervousness and speech anxiety, which affects their confidence and fluency when speaking English in class (Babakhouya, 2019). According to Roslan et al. (2018), students with neurotic tendencies frequently experience stress from speaking assignments, which makes it harder for them to concentrate effectively in front of others. This statement is further supported by the study's qualitative findings. Students with high level neuroticism often described themselves as "nervous" and reported that anxiety made their speech "less fluent" and even caused them to "forget" the vocabulary they should have spoken. In addition, Paulus et al. (2016) found that neuroticism is highly correlated with psychological inflexibility, emotional dysregulation, and shame, all of which are associated with anxiety indicators. These responses demonstrate how neuroticism inhibits students' ability to organize and convey their thoughts fluently by causing them to experience negative feelings.

On the other hand, when performing speaking assignments, students with lower levels of neuroticism displayed more optimistic outlooks and affective coping strategies (Saracevic, 2019). According to the results of the interviews, they frequently employed non-formal learning techniques, like watching movies, listening to podcasts, or listening to English-language music, in addition to the teacher's explanations in class. These techniques significantly improved their oral language proficiency while encouraging self-assurance. This is consistent with research by Lubis et al. (2024) and Marpaung and Widyantoro (2020), who highlight how personality variables affect how language learners perceive feedback and stay motivated.

The majority of students agree that the primary causes of speech anxiety among students were low self-esteem, fear of ridicule, and a lack of preparation time. These were followed by feelings of nervousness or embarrassment and anxiety when giving a speech on their own. This is also in line with studies by Handayani et al. (2020), which discovered that speaking caused

a lot of anxiety among students.. This explains why fluency and confidence are more challenging for students with high levels of neuroticism.

Interestingly, not all studies agree on the negative role of neuroticism. In line with Putri et al. (2023) that discovered that students with neuroticism performed better on speaking tests than students with other personality types, the study found that fear may occasionally act as a motivator, allowing students to perform effectively. According to Yerkes-Dodson's Law, as cited in Iruo et al. (2021), increased anxiety and enthusiasm levels may assist in focusing motivation and attention on the assignment at hand. The high stakes of the speaking exam and the presence of peers as an audience, however, possibly be the reason why the balance in this study appears to lean more toward inhibition than augmentation. These circumstances might have made students with high level of neuroticism feel more anxious, which would have hindered rather than improved their performance.

These findings have significant implications for teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). Babakhouya (2019) suggests that EFL teachers are expected to be concerned of their students' personality. According to this study, students who score high on neuroticism are more likely to experience anxiety associated with English, so understanding about every learner's personality in the classroom might help identify those students. Teachers must understand that students with high level of neuroticism need further support and strategies when participating in speaking activities. To reduce the dread of receiving a poor grade, it is crucial to establish a classroom that is secure and encouraging. Techniques like organized feedback, speaking projects in small groups or pairs, and a gradual introduction to public speaking would potentially help reduce anxiety. It has also been demonstrated that students with low level of neuroticism can improve their speaking abilities by using informal learning tactics, thus teachers should encourage its use outside of the classroom.

In addition, these result increase the understanding of the Big Five Personality traits in relation to teaching English as Foreign Language (EFL). This study emphasizes the distinct impact of neuroticism in influencing students' speaking experience, despite the fact that the majority of the literature has concentrated on characteristics like extroversion or self awareness in relation to language learning. This highlight how crucial it is to take consideration of individual differences in affective and cognitive capacities when developing classroom strategies in order to accomplish learning objectives.

CONCLUSION

Based to this study, neuroticism has a significant impact on students' speaking skills. Significant differences between students' with high and low neuroticism are supported by quantitative analysis, and three fundamental mechanisms, such as speaking anxiety, learning strategies, and learning attitudes, are shown by qualitative interviews. While students with low neuroticism used a variety of informal learning strategies and reacted more positively to corrective feedback from the teacher and classmates, students with high neuroticism had higher speaking anxiety and employed less efficient strategies for preparing the speaking task. These results increase our understanding of the Big Five framework's relationship between personality and language learning, especially as it relates to EFL in Indonesia. This research has practical implications for EFL instruction as well as theoretical contributions to the literature on the acquisition of second languages. However, the scope of this study is limited to a single educational institution with specific demographics, which may limit generalizations to different cultural and academic settings. Future research should examine other personality traits that might interact with neuroticism in the setting of language learning, and should involve larger and more diverse populations. Furthermore, longitudinal research that tracks the connection

between speaking skills and personality over an extended period of time could provide significant insights into developmental patterns. In order to achieve optimal the learning outcomes for every student, these findings ultimately highlight how essential it is for English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers to take individual personality characteristics consideration when creating speaking curriculum and putting teaching strategies into application in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Alrasheedi, S. (2020). Investigation of Factors Influencing Speaking Performance of Saudi EFL Learners. *Arab World English Journal*, *11*(4), 66–77. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no4.5

Alvarez, C. L., Tamayo, M. R., & Santos, J. C. dos. (2024). Factors influencing the development of speaking skills among Ecuadorian EFL learners: Teachers' perspectives. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(2), 319–331. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i2.74889

Astuti, P., & Lammers, J. C. (2017). Individual accountability in cooperative learning: More opportunities to produce spoken English. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(1), 215–228. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i1.6878

Atmojo, A. E. P., & Nugroho, A. (2020). EFL Classes Must Go Online! Teaching Activities and Challenges during COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia. *Register Journal*, *13*(1), 49–76. https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v13i1.49-76

Babakhouya, Y. (2019). The Big Five personality factors as predictors of English language speaking anxiety: A cross-country comparison between Morocco and South Korea. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, *14*(4), 502–521. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499919894792

Cao, C., & Meng, Q. (2020). Exploring personality traits as predictors of English achievement and global competence among Chinese university students: English learning motivation as the moderator. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *101814*(July 2019), 101814. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.101814

Chen, X., He, J., Swanson, E., Cai, Z., & Fan, X. (2022). Big Five Personality Traits and Second Language Learning: a Meta-analysis of 40 Years' Research. In *Educational Psychology Review* (Vol. 34). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09641-6

Costa, P. T., & Mccrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. *Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources*.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. In *Writing Center Talk over Time: A Mixed-Method Study*. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429469237

Dahlia, D., Intiana, S. R. H., & Husniati. (2023). Kemampuan Berbicara Siswa Kelas V SD Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Educatio*, *9*(4), 2164–2170. https://doi.org/10.31949/educatio.v9i4.6250

Dawaele, J.-M., Magdalena, A. F., & Saito, K. (2019). The Effect of Perception of Teacher Characteristics on Spanish EFL Learners' Anxiety and Enjoyment. *The Modern Language Journal*, *103*(2), 412–427. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12555

Dewaele, J.-M., & Al-Saraj, T. M. (2015). Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety of Arab learners of English: The effect of personality, linguistic and sociobiographical variables. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *5*(2), 205–228. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2015.5.2.2

Dewi, D. S., Siahaan, S., & Putri, N. N. (2020). the Correlation Between Students' Personality

and Students' Speaking Skill. *ANGLO-SAXON: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, *11*(2), 289–299. https://doi.org/10.33373/as.v11i2.2784

Ebrahimi, M. R., Khoshsima, H., Zare-Behtash, E., & Heydarnejad, T. (2018). Emotional Intelligence enhancement impacts on developing speaking skill among EFL learners: An empirical study. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(4), 625–640. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11439a

Gacs, A., Goertler, S., & Spasova, S. (2020). Planned online language education versus crisis-prompted online language teaching: Lessons for the future. *Foreign Language Annals*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12460

Gragersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2010). Language Learning Perfectionism : Anxious and Non-Anxious Language Learners' Reactions to Their Own Oral Perfomance. *The Modern Language Journal*, *86*(4), 562–570. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1192725

Hanifa, R. (2018). Factors generating anxiety when learning EFL speaking skills. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *5*(2), 230–239. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.10932

Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 112–126.

Iruo, L. A., Ene-Peter, J., & Okolo, S. O. (2021). Correlations Between Anxiety, Depression and Academic Achievements Among New Students in a Nursing Programme in South - South Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, *6*(9), 119–137.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.). In *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102–138). Guilford Press.

Karim, N. A., Abidin, D. Z., & Ali, S. N. D. M. (2016). Personality factors and second language acquisition: An islamic viewpoint. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, *11*(5), 12–19.

Lubis, J. P., Fitri, N. Z. N., & Ridwan, S. C. (2024). Pentingnya Menguasai Bahasa Inggris dan Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Kemampuan Berbahasa Inggris. *Karimah Tauhid*, *3*(3), 3599–3605. https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i3.12553

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The Subtle Effects of Language Anxiety on Cognitive Processing in the Second Language. *Language Learning*, *44*(2), 283–305. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x

Mantra, I. B. N., & Maba, W. (2018). Enhancing The EFL Learners' Speaking Skill Through Folktales Based Instruction. *SHS Web of Conferences*, *42*(00017), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200017

Marpaung, D. V., & Widyantoro, A. (2020). EFL Learners' Big Five Personalities, Language Learning Strategies, and Speaking Skills. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, *5*(1), 73. https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v5i1.224

Nurilahi, R., & Suhartono, L. (2022). an Analysis on the Cause of Students' Speaking Anxiety in Efl Classroom. *Journal of English Education Program*, *3*(2), 95–104. https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v3i2.54273

Ożańska-Ponikwia, K., Piechurska-Kuciel, E., & Skałacka, K. (2020). Emotional intelligence as a mediator in the relationship between neuroticism and L2 achievement. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *14*(1), 67–86. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0008

Paulus, D. J., Vanwoerden, S., Norton, P. J., & Sharp, C. (2016). From neuroticism to anxiety: Examining unique contributions of three transdiagnostic vulnerability factors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *94*, 38–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.01.012

Putri, A. D., Jaya, A., & Marleni, M. (2023). Exploring the Students' Speaking Ability Based on Their Different Personalities. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, *6*(1), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v6i1.10203

Roslan, N. S., Izhar, L. I., Feng, Y. X., Faye, I., Ho, E. T. W., & Rahman, M. A. (2018). An investigation of physiological correlates of neuroticism during speaking task: A preliminary study. *2018 IEEE-EMBS Conference on Biomedical Engineering and Sciences, (IECBES)*, 515–519. https://doi.org/10.1109/IECBES.2018.08626721

Wulandari, O. (2024). Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Think Pair Share Pada Pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Untuk Meningkatkan Keterampilan Berbicara Siswa. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu Akademik*, *1*(4), 132–143. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61722/jmia.v1i4.1961