JELTS
JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AND CULTURAL STUDIE

Students Temperament Characteristics and Strategy Inventory for Language Learning: Mediating Students Speaking Online Learning

Asri Nurlaely[1], John Pahamzah[2]
[1,2] Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa
asrinurlaely@yahoo.com

Submitted: January 12, 2022 *Revised:* March 21, 2022 *Accepted:* March 25, 2022

Abstract

In teaching and learning process of English, the teacher should manage both students temperament and language learning strategies since those have contribution to the students' language achievements along with the purposes of the education. The objectives of this research are (1) to investigate is there any correlation between students' temperament characteristics with speaking skill; (2) to investigate is there any correlation between the strategy inventory for language learning with students' speaking skill; and (3) to investigate is there any correlation between students' temperament characteristics and the strategy inventory for language learning with students' speaking skill. This research was employed by quantitative approach through correlation method. The population was the students at Holmesglen Language Centre Tangerang, and the researcher took 30 students as the sample. This research proves that the sig.F change value is 0.532 > 0.05, so the decision was Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. This concludes that there is no significant correlation between temperament characteristics, strategy inventory for language learning with speaking skill.

Keywords: strategy inventory, speaking, temperament characteristics

Introduction

English is a tool which may connect people to the entire world communicatively, especially in speaking skill. In Holmesglen Language Centre, there are many students from various faculties. Some of them are able to reach the minimum criteria of accomplishment for the English subject (materials; introduction, telling daily activities, telling the past experiences, and getting the point of short monologue and short conversation). The one of challenges for students' speaking class is having fluency. The problems that most students faced in speaking was having a lack of vocabulary, not being confident to speak, not being used to talking in class, and difficulty expressing words or sentences. The cause of problems most students faced was being afraid of making errors. The students' responses and active performance in speaking English have a link with the psychological aspects, including personality.

In speaking learning, the teacher should know students temperament, because temperament is the one of the psychology aspects that has contribution to the student's language achievements. Temperament has an important role on English achievement when the students learn about language especially English, they need a mood booster. The students' temperament will affect how they learn in the class In speaking class, the students should speak in front of the class.

Same students do it well and not with some others. Some students are talkative and some students keep quite. In this case, quite students are worried will do mistake or fell anxiety. On other hand, the talkative students have full confidence and do not think about the mistakes. This is what psychology called as personality temperament. According to Allison (2014), there are four temperaments characteristics in one class that represent personality above. Personality of students is very influential towards their speaking fluency. They are choleric, sanguine, melancholic, and phlegmatic temperaments. Clearly, the choleric is personality with strong principle, has good leadership, and good in speaking. The sanguine is the cheerful and skillful persons who always want to be famous person. The melancholic is perfectionist personality and has analytical thinking. The phlegmatic is thick, slow-moving and almost stagnant in nature. Oxford and Ehrman in William and Burden (2004) say that in order to create an effective learning in a way to achieve the successful of second or foreign language learning, students' individual differences of their temperaments characteristics should be identified and well-comprehended as the important consideration by second or foreign language teachers.

One of the ways the students want to be successful in speaking is learning strategies. Language learning strategies were thought to be essentially for the students to achieve the purposes of the education. Oxford (2003) classified the general learning strategies into direct and indirect Strategies. In direct strategies, it divided into three which are memory strategies, cognitive strategies and compensation strategies; while in indirect strategies also divided into three, which are metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. By applying good language learning strategies, students should hopefully manage, arrange, monitor, and evaluate their own learning. As the goal, this condition can lead students to be independent learning. In addition, language learning strategies are good tools for students to solve the problems they found during the process of learning in speaking.

By language learning strategies, the students can directly maintain their topic in daily conversation, as it was difficult for them to arrange them in their speaking. Since students can value their motive to speak, they also can decide to start or end the conversation briefly. In particular, language learning strategies can be applied by the students to improve their speaking. Furthermore, Wenden in Griffits (2003) argues that learning strategies is a helpful problem-solving engine which may lead students to be able in managing their own learning to gain achievement. Besides, in order to see how and how well students do things of second or foreign language instructional, learning strategies are necessary (Murcia, 2001). Lee (2010) says

that learning strategies become one of the most important factors to be investigated in order to help foreign language learner to do a set of moves to acquire the knowledge of language skills in the classroom setting or outside the classroom setting in a way for achieving the successful language learning.

There have been some previous studies that discussed the issue regarding the importance of speaking skills in ELT, such as Fadlilah, Gailea, & Baihaqi (2020); Kayi (2006); Syafrizal, Effendy, Gailea, & Liana (2019); and Syafrizal, Gailea, Pahamzah, Juniardi, & Nikmah (2020). However, the studies on how the relationship between students' temperament characteristics and learning strategies towards speaking skills seem to have not been studied. Therefore, this research is expected to bridge the gap above.

Theoretical Review

Speaking Skill

Speaking is one of two productive skills in a language teaching. Brown (2004) defined speaking as a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed; those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of a test-taker listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reliability and validity of an oral production test. Nunan (2003) defines that speaking consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning. To know deeper what speaking is, Nunan differentiates it from writing. First, in spoken language, speaking must be listened by others. It has temporary and immediate reception. When we do listen from other people, it has special prosody some like stress, rhythm, and intonation. It must be there an intermediate feedback for communicating directly. By speaking activity, orator or speaker have to pay attention of planning and editing by channel, whereas the second, in written language, the activity is done as a visual term. The time for doing it, is permanent and it is delayed reception. The writer uses punctuation as well to make others clearer in vision or reading the meaning. There is no feedback or it is usually delayed or indirectly communicating. The planning is unlimited and there are often editing and revision in any parts of the written language.

Cameron (2001) stated that speaking is the active use of language to express meaning so that the other people can make sense of them. It could be said that the ability to speak a language is synonymous with knowing the language since speech is the most basic means of human communication. Moreover, it involves the speaker to use speech to express meanings to other people (Spratt, Pulverness, & Williams, 2005). Caroline (2005) defines that speaking is a basic oral communication among people in society. It is speaking which serves as natural means of communication of the members of the community for both expression of

thought and form a social behaviour. Additionally, Kayi (2006) says that speaking is the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal in variety of context. Furthermore, Gower et al., in Syafrizal et al., (2019) stated that speaking has many different aspects: accuracy and fluency. Accuracy involves the correct of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation; while fluency can be thought of the ability to keep going when speaking spontaneously.

Based on the views above, speaking skill is seen as an activity of focusing on conversation to achieve specific purposes, e.g. to get or exchange information, etc., or is described in terms of its basic competences used in daily conversation such as, giving directions, expressing feelings etc. Researcher can be concluded that the definition of speaking is one of ways in expressing idea, thought or feeling into words in oral form, so they can get the message of the utterances.

The Temperament

Temperament is a fundamental inherited style that belongs to everyone naturally. It is characterized each person to others. This makes individual differences of their actual behaviors between each other. The term of temperament is related to mood and emotion. Since, temperament is genetically-rooted things that personally encourages to the way of someone moves and respond to people in environment around. Naturally, the unique thing of a human being is related to the possibility of human being acts (Jung, 2001). In fact, students' temperaments differences are linked to the students' individual differences in language acquisition.

The term of temperament is often used to refer mood of a person. Furthermore, Oxford and Ehrman in William and Burden (2004, p. 88) say that in order to create an effective learning in a way to achive the successfull of second or foreign language learning, students' individual differences of their temperaments characteristics should be identified and well-comprehended as the important consideration by second or foreign language teachers.

The Four Temperaments

The four temperaments; (1) sanguine, (2) choleric, (3) phlegmatic, and (4) melancholic are keys which may facilitate students to solve the problems in language learning according to Allison (2014,p. 1). It is because, the four temperament types may support students to be aware of their strengths and weaknesses deeper to adapt the language learning situation nicely and wisely to respond the language learning actively says Rudolf Steiner in Allison (2014). Furthermore, according to Green (2014), Hippocrates found that "specified behaviors were consistent with each particular body fluid and that each person's fluids were consistent." For example, the typical of Choleric students will always compete with

the circumstances around to be the best because they are typical of the goal-oriented one. However, it will not happen to the Phlegmatic students. Phlegmatic students are typical of not goal-oriented students.

Strategy Inventory for Language Learning

The inventory of strategies for second or foreign language learner is very helpful to encourage the language learning process in order to get complex skills like foreign language according to Brown (2007). Weinsten and Mayer (in Macaro, 2011) state that language learning strategies are what learners engage during learning involving behaviors and thoughts. Meanwhile, Oxford (2003) states that a comprehensive about language learning strategies is specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that student use to improve their own progress in developing skills in a second or foreign language. Based on some explanation by the experts above, it can be summarized that the definition of language learning strategies are all the actions, behavior, steps, techniques, and thoughts of the learners to improve their language learning.

Oxford (2003) classifies the general learning strategies into Direct and Indirect Strategies. In direct strategies, it divided into three which are memory strategies, cognitive strategies and compensation strategies; while in indirect strategies also divided into three, which are metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. Those strategies connect between each other in order to manipulate or overcome some different tasks according to the lessons' needs. Then, those strategies are also helpful in order to facilitate students who have individual differences between each other (fit to certain personality types) which may encourage students to achieve the language learning objectives. Since, as cited by Leavell and Hong-Nam from Rubin (2006), those strategies can give a great contribution to develop the construction of the language system and can give a positive effect to students directly on the language learning process.

Method

This research was a kind of a quantitative research and using correlational research design. According to Sigh (2006), correlation finds any relationship between the different abilities of the individual or they or independent of each other. Similarly, Pallant (2011) stated that correlation analysis is used to describe the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables. Siregar (2013) explained the correlational study that is a statistical test to determine the tendency or pattern for two (or more) variables, this is means that two variables share common variance, or co-vary together.

In this research, there were three variables; X^1, X^2, and Y. The first variable was students' temperament characteristics (independent variable = X^1), the second one was the strategy inventory for language

learning (independent variable = X^2), and the third was speaking skill as dependent variable (Y). Then, cluster random sampling was used by researchers to select particular samples to be representative from the population.

The population of the research was the students at Holmesglen Language Centre Tangerang who came from different faculties and took only advance class. In this research, the researchers took 30 samples by putting all the little rolled-up papers that contained the students' entire name into a box and picking them up one by one until getting 4-5 students' names for each class.

In this research, data of speaking was collected from a test. The test was speaking test. The type of speaking test was oral test. The test consists of 6 items which was valid. The respondent who did the test was 30 students Holmesglen Language Centre students the sample of the research. The data of temperament characteristics collected from a questionnaire. The test consisted of 40 items which were valid. The respondent who did the test was 30 students at Holmesglen Language Centre sample of the research. From the result of the Personality test, there were four temperament characteristics. The data of SILL collected from a test. The test consisted of 50 items which were valid.

There were two pre-requirement testing in this research, those were: normality testing to know the distribution of the data normal or not and linearity testing to know the form of regression or not. Normality testing distribution purposed to know whether the variable data research data research distribution was normal or not. There were three kinds of the testing of normality data in this research, normality of temperament characteristics, normality strategy inventory for language learning and normality of speaking skill. If the data was normal, so the parametric statistic used to analyze the data. the researchers used Kolmogorov-Smirnov formula through SPSS at the level of significant 5% and the result of the computation of the normality test saw on the following table.

Table 1. Normality Test

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Speaking	,130	30	,200*	,949	30	,155
Choleric	,235	30	,000	,894	30	,006
Sanguine	,254	30	,000	,853	30	,001
Phlegmatic	,070	30	,200*	,990	30	,993
Melancholy	,100	30	,200*	,968	30	,489
Memory	,119	30	,200*	,966	30	,426
Cognitive	,159	30	,051	,942	30	,100
Compensation	,114	30	,200*	,963	30	,369
Metacognitive	,141	30	,130	,964	30	,386
Affective	,125	30	,200*	,959	30	,294
Social	,107	30	,200*	,966	30	,433

The normality testing distribution from four temperament characteristic at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, showed that variable data of choleric was 0.06. The variable data of sanguine was 0.001. The variable data of phlegmatic was 0.993 and the variable data of melancholy was 0.489. So, the variable

data of temperament characteristic was in normal distribution. While, the normality testing distribution from SILL for N= 30 at Holmesglen Language Centre at the level of significance α = 0.05. The result showed that variable data of memory strategies was 0.426. The variable data of cognitive strategies was 0.100. The variable data of compensation strategies was 0.369. The variable data of metacognitive strategies was 0.386. The variable data of affective strategies was 0.294 and the variable data of social strategies was 0.433. The variable data of SILL was in normal distribution. The normality testing distribution from speaking skill for the number of respondents was 30 at Holmesglen language centre at the level of significance α = 0.05 was 0.155. The result showed that variable data of speaking skill was in normal distribution.

Result

The first hypothesis on this research was that there was no significant correlation between temperament characteristics and speaking skill at Holmesglen Language Centre students. To test the hypothesis, the researcher analyzed the data using the Pearson Product Moment Formula. The statistical formulations of the first hypothesis were as followed: Ho: r count > r table. It meant that there was significant correlation between X1 and Y; Ho: r count < r table. It meant that there was no significant correlation between X1 and Y

The result of computation showed that the correlation coefficient (r) between temperament characteristics and speaking skill as showed on the following table.

Table 2. Correlations of X^1 to Y

		Speaking	Choleric	Sanguine	Phlegmatic	Melancholy
Speaking	Pearson Correlation	1	-,206	,352	,065	-,235
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,274	,057	,733	,212
	N	30	30	30	30	30
Choleric	Pearson Correlation	-,206	1	-,191	-,599**	-,091
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,274		,311	,000	,631
	N	30	30	30	30	30
Sanguine	Pearson Correlation	,352	-,191	1	-,216	-,607**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,057	,311		,253	,000
	N	30	30	30	30	30
Phlegmatic	Pearson Correlation	,065	-,599**	-,216	1	-,288
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,733	,000	,253		,123
	N	30	30	30	30	30
Melancholy	Pearson Correlation	-,235	-,091	-,607**	-,288	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,212	,631	,000	,123	
	N	30	30	30	30	30

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

Based on the result, it could be seen that r count of choleric with speaking was -0.206. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (-0.206) < r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation coefficient number was negative, so the correlation would inversely proportional. That was, if speaking skill was moderate and then choleric was high, and otherwise. From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was

rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by choleric. Furthermore, it could be seen that r count of sanguine with speaking was 0.352. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (0.352) > r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation was positive (sanguine and speaking was positively correlated), it meant that these variables tend to increase together (greater sanguine was associated with greater speaking). From the result that there was significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was rejected and Ha was accepted. It meant that the speaking skill was influenced by sanguine.

Furthermore, it could be seen that r count of phlegmatic with speaking was 0.065. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (0.065) < r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation was positive (phlegmatic and speaking was positively correlated), it meant that these variables tend to increase together (greater phlegmatic was associated with greater speaking). From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by phlegmatic.

Furthermore, it could be seen that r count of melancholy with speaking was -0.235. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (-0.235) < r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation coefficient number was negative, so the correlation would inversely proportional. That was, if speaking skill was moderate and then melancholy was high, and otherwise. From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by melancholy. As a result from table above, the finding showed that there were four temperament characteristics, but only one temperament characteristics was sanguine which was correlation between speaking skill. And the other temperament characteristics (choleric, phlegmatic, and melancholy) were no significance correlation between speaking skill.

The second hypothesis on this research was that there was significant correlation between strategy inventory for language learning and speaking skill at Holmesglen Language Centre students. To test the hypothesis, the researcher analyzed the data using the Pearson Product Moment Formula through SPSS 20.0 for windows. The statistical formulations of the second hypothesis were as follow:

Ho: r count > r table. It meant that there was significant correlation between X2 and Y

Ho: r count < r table. It meant that there was no significant correlation between X2 and Y

The result of computation showed that the correlation coefficient (r) between strategy inventory for language learning and speaking skill as showed on the following table.

JELTS
JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AND CULTURAL STUDIE

Table 3. Correlation Coefficient

		Speaking	Memory	Cognitive	Compensation	Metacognitive	Affective	Social
Speaking	Pearson Correlation	1	-,102	,098	,003	-,082	,092	,168
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,591	,605	,989	,667	,629	,376
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Memory	Pearson Correlation	-,102	1	,607**	,415*	,463**	-,099	,172
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,591		,000	,023	,010	,601	,362
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Cognitive	Pearson Correlation	,098	,607**	1	,316	,485**	,211	,358
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,605	,000		,089	,007	,263	,052
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Compensation	Pearson Correlation	,003	,415*	,316	1	,159	,064	,156
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,989	,023	,089		,401	,738	,410
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Metacognitive	Pearson Correlation	-,082	,463**	,485**	,159	1	,189	,044
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,667	,010	,007	,401		,318	,818
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Affective	Pearson Correlation	,092	-,099	,211	,064	,189	1	,140
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,629	,601	,263	,738	,318		,462
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Social	Pearson Correlation	,168	,172	,358	,156	,044	,140	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,376	,362	,052	,410	,818	,462	
	N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Based on the result, it could be seen that r count of memory strategies with speaking was -0.102. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (-0.102) <r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation coefficient number was negative, so the correlation would inversely proportional. That was, if speaking skill was moderate and then memory strategies was high, and otherwise. From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by memory strategies. Furthermore, it could be seen that r count of cognitive strategies with speaking was 0.098. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (0.098) < r table (0.296).The direction of the correlation was positive (cognitive strategies and speaking was positively correlated), it meant that these variables tend to increase together (greater cognitive strategies was associated with greater speaking). From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by cognitive strategies.

Furthermore, it could be seen that r count of compensation strategies with speaking was 0.003. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (0.003) < r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation was positive (compensation strategies and speaking was positively correlated), it meant that these variables tend to increase together (greater compensation strategies was associated with greater speaking). From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was

rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by compensation strategies. Furthermore, it could be seen that r count of metacognitive strategies with speaking was -0.082. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (-0.082) < r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation coefficient number was negative, so the correlation would inversely proportional. That was, if speaking skill was moderate and then metacognitive strategies was high, and otherwise. From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by metacognitive strategies.

Furthermore, it could be seen that r count of affective strategies with speaking was 0.092. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (0.092) < r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation was positive (cognitive strategies and speaking was positively correlated), it meant that these variables tend to increase together (greater affective strategies was associated with greater speaking). From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by affective strategies. Furthermore, it could be seen that r count of social strategies with speaking was 0.168. The obtained result in this research meant that r count (0.168) < r table (0.296). The direction of the correlation was positive (cognitive strategies and speaking was positively correlated), it meant that these variables tend to increase together (greater social strategies was associated with greater speaking). From the result that there was no significance correlation and the significance correlation meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. It meant that the speaking skill was not influenced by social strategies. As a result shown from the tables 3 above, the finding proves that there is no relationship between the strategy inventories for language learning with speaking skill. It is because r count was lower than r table.

The third hypothesis on this research was that there was no significant correlation between temperament characteristics, strategy inventory for language learning and speaking skill at Holmesglen Language Centre students. To test the hypothesis, the researcher analyzed the data using the Pearson Product Moment formula. The statistical formulations of the second hypothesis were as follow:

Ho: sig>α. It meant that there was no significant correlation between X1, X2 simultaneously and Y.

Ho: sig< α. It meant that there was significant correlation between X1, X2 simultaneously and Y.

The result of Multiple Correlation formula is shown on the table as follows.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.48181/jelts.v5i1.14643

Table 4. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	,540[a]	,292	-,027	7,225	,292	,915	9	20	,532

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social, Phlegmatic, Compensation, Sanguine, Metacognitive, Affective, Cognitive, Memory, Choleric

Based on the model summary table, it knew that the measure of the relationship between temperament characteristics and strategy inventory for language learning with speaking skills which was calculated by the correlation coefficient was 0.540, this indicated a moderate effect. While, the simultaneous contribution of temperament characteristics and SILL variables to speaking skill was 29.2%, while 70.8% was determined by other variables. Based on the model summary table obtained the probability (sig.F change) = 0.532, because the sig.F change value is 0.532 > 0.05, then the decision was Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. it meant that there was no significant correlation between X1, X2 simultaneously and Y.

Conclusion

The result proves that there is no relationship between temperament characteristics with students' speaking skill at Holmesglen Language Centre. The finding shows that there are four temperament characteristics, but only one temperament characteristics was sanguine which is correlation between speaking skill. The other temperament characteristics (choleric, phlegmatic, and melancholy) are no significance correlation between speaking skill. For the second hypothesis, there is no correlation between strategy inventory for language learning and the students' speaking skill at the Holmesglen Language Centre. It is because r count < r table. For the third hypothesis, there is no significant correlation between temperament characteristics, strategy inventory for language learning, and students' speaking skill at Holmesglen Language Centre. Based on the model summary table obtained the probability (sig.F change) = 0.532, because the sig.F change value is 0.532 > 0.05, then the decision is Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected. It means that there is no significant correlation between X1, X2 simultaneously and Y.

Regarding the result, further researches are recommended. This work may be further developed through mixed-method to get better understanding towards the issue.

References

Allison, J. (2014). *Boys alive! Bring out their best*. Boston: Grey Media.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment principles and classroom practice*. San Francisco: Francisco State Universities.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. 3rd Ed. New York: Pearson-Longman.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Caroline, T. (2005). *Practical English language teaching young learners*. New York: Mc. Graw-Hill.

Murcia, C. (2001).*Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. 3rd Ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle-Thompson Learning.

Fadlilah, N., Gailea, N., & Baihaqi, A. (2020, September). Students' study habit in speaking skill (At Eleventh Grade of Manahijussadat Islamic Boarding School Lebak Banten). In *Proceeding AISELT (Annual International Seminar on English Language Teaching)* (Vol. 4, No. 4).

Green, Z. (2014). *Individuality empowerment advocate & resilience expert.* New York: Personal Growth Enterprises.

Griffits, C. (2003). *Language learning strategy use and proficiency*. Auckland: The University of Auckland.

Jung. (2001). *Philosophy: Ethics-Jung's Psychological Types. Philosophy.* Lander.edu

Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote in second language. *TSL Journal. Vol. 12*.

Lee, C. Kuo. (2010). *An overview of language learning strategies*. ARECLS. Vol.7. p:134.

Littauer,F. & Sweet, R. (2011). *Personality plus at work: How to work successfully with anyone*. New York: Baker Publishing Group-Green Press Initiative.

Macaro, E. (2011). *Learning strategies in foreign and second language classroom*. Great Britain: CPD, Ebbw Vale.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGrawHill.

Oxford, R. L. (2003). *Language learning styles and strategies*. Mouton de Gruyter

Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS (4th edition).* Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Palmer, M. Q. (2007). *Temperamental and joint attentional predictors of language development*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Siregar, S. (2013). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenanda Media Group.

Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2005). *The teaching knowledge test course.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Syafrizal, S., Effendy, S. E., Gailea, N., & Liana, T. N. L. R. (2019). Correlational Study of Language Learning Attitude and Speaking In Indonesian Context (a Case Study). *Journal of English Language Studies 3*(1), 63-79.

Syafrizal, S., Gailea, N., Pahamzah, J., Juniardi, Y., & Nikmah, I. F. (2020). The Correlation of Students' Learning Styles, Learning Motivation, and Speaking Ability. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Cultural Studies*, *3*(2), 73-81.