LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 25, No. 1, April 2022, pp. 149-159

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

AN EXPLORATION ON STUDENTS' PUBLIC SPEAKING ANXIETY: STIFIn PERSPECTIVE

Benni Ichsanda Rahman Hz
Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara Medan, Indonesia
correspondence: benni.ichsanda@uinsu.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v25i1.4502
received 31 March 2022; accepted 10 May 2022

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine the level of public speaking anxiety among students based on the differences in human intelligence machine division: STIFIn (Sensing, Thinking, Intuiting, Feeling, and Insting). This study involved 51 Management students who took the English for Specific course on their semester credits. This study employs a case study that is qualitative in nature. The data was gathered using a semi-structured approach. The data collected was then processed by using two methods: statistical calculations for quantitative data related to the results of filling out 17 Public Speaking Anxiety Scale (FLAS) questionnaires by students concerning their level of anxiety when performing a public speaking and constructive analysis for qualitative data related to the results of comparing respondents' responses. The results show that students in the Insting personality have a higher average of public speaking anxiety: 51.60. Students who are Sensing have an average anxiety level of 49.25, whereas students who are Thinking have an anxiety level of 47.50. In comparison, Intuiting students have an average anxiety level of 48.66, while Feeling students have an average anxiety level of 50.17. Consider the implications, some suggestions are discussed to overcome the challenges..

Keywords: anxiety, brain dominance, personality, public speaking

Introduction

Although there have been numerous studies on the relationship between personality and speaking ability factors (Fazeli, 2011 in Foroozandehfar & Khalili, 2019), there has been no research on speaking ability factors based on the distinction of human intelligence machine. Speaking ability is influenced by a number of variables, one of which is anxiousness (Marwa & Thamrin, 2016). Various studies on anxiety in public speaking based on personality have been conducted (Boroujeni et al., 2015; Marwa & Thamrin, 2016), but it is still inadequate in the context of it's relation to distinction of human brain capability.

There are some theories that divide human personality based on brain dominance. One of these is the STIFIn method for dividing the human brain's ability, which is being the topic of this study. STIFIn is a tool for determining a

person's genetic personality potential (Dini, 2022 in Poniman, 2009). The separation of the powers of the human brain by STIFIn was created in 1999, since the psychological analytical method pioneered by Carl Gustav Jung, coupled with Ned Herrmann's theory of The Whole Brain Concept and theory Tiune Brain, is more scientifically based in the STIFIn tests started by Poniman (2009). The STIFIn technique is based on the STIFIn idea, which combines psychological, neurology, and human resource science theories (Alindra, 2018). It is achieved by fingerprints scanning, in which fingerprints provide information about the nervous system's makeup, which is then analyzed and linked to certain brain areas that act as the main operating system and machine intelligence (Rafianti & Pujiastuti, 2017).

STIFIn stands for Sensing, Thinking, Intuiting, Feeling, and Insting (Poniman, 2009), which are then these five types of personality known as Intelligence Machine (Agung & Rustandi, 2017, p.46), while the intelligence steering consists of introverts and extroverts (Poniman, 2009). Genetic personality in STIFIn is formed from a combination of intelligence engine and intelligence steering (Dini, 2022). Thus, there are 9 types of genetic personality, namely Sensing extrovert (Se), Sensing introvert (Si), Thinking extrovert (Te), Thinking introvert (Ti), Intuiting extrovert (Ie), Intuiting introvert (Ii), Feeling extrovert (Fe).), Feeling introvert (Fi), and Instinct (In) [(Dini, 2022 cited Poniman, 2009)]. This notion becomes the STIFIn genetic personality identification paradigm, in which only one dominant genetic personality is identified and developed (Poniman, 2009).

Hz (2021, p.14) following the study of Poniman & Mangussara (2013) and Mundiri & Zahra (2017) further explains these five brain distinctions: 1) **Sensing** has to do with the way they learn by remembering, how they play, how strong their muscles are, how often they study, and how they focus on their lessons. It also has to do with their own chemistry and how it affects their power with a stable social role and how much money they have. The best way to learn how to sense people is to look at other people. Record how the best people do something, then do it the same way. They should do upcopy if possible. The more practice they have, the better their skills become. They start with a small amount and then add on little by little (Hz, 2021, p.14).

Furthermore, When Sensing individuals are pushed from the outside, they develop a more withdrawn and apprehensive temperament. They would, however, dare to attempt to maximize their existing power potential. Even when it comes to speaking up, if they have been forged through disciplined training and experience, Sensing feels most entitled to stand in the front row, despite their initial shyness (Poniman, 2011). However, the component that most assist the Sensing type master the lesson is repetition of practice questions: answering all types of questions from easy to tough or solving problems. This type of experience will always be a prerequisite for success. For the Sensing personality type, the most successful method of learning is through trial and error. Exercises that are repeated are an effective technique to maintain muscle memory. The more frequently they train, the more muscle memory is developed, resulting in increase in this type of talent (Poniman, 2011).

Moreover, 2) **Thinking** personality is so inclined to the throne with a social role in power, decisiveness, and independence that they have a computational learning style, serious habits, greatness in logic, a focus on friendship, the path to

success by setting priorities, and blood type stimulus A (Hz, 2021, p.15). The most effective method of developing thinking strategies is for students to make advantage of their left brain's ability to analyze. They observe a work process or task, then identify flaws, make improvements, and monitor the results. They continue to do so until they observe beneficial effects. They pore over the instructions, observing and mastering the structure and procedure. They next go through as much data as possible to fine-tune the analysis. Poniman (2011) emphasizes that Thinking people think positively and feel they can. They are also analytical, which means they think analytically about a system's pieces, like to debate and discuss, like to compete for something, and have a powerful and formal attitude. In addition, Thinking type immediately functions in its regular effective style of working. This category treats work with a high standard of output. This type of operation must be efficient and precise. Finally, the Thinking individuals will oversee the process and organize the system so that the activities operate smoothly. Otherwise, 3) **Intuiting** people have a way of learning that is based on patterns and habits, and they are creative, classy, knowledgeable, and influential in words. This is because their social role is to be creative, classy, intelligent, and influential in words, and this is how they learn about the world and the world around them. The best way to learn how to read people is to use their right brain's ability to look for ideas and patterns, which is what you should do. Ideas and patterns can be found in books, films, magazines, TV shows, and more. They can be found anywhere. They always try to find something new from what they have seen, heard, or read. These people look for patterns in the things they have learned so they can connect it with the information they want to learn more about. They have the most important thing: imagination and creativity (Hz, 2021, p.15).

In addition, 4) **Feeling** tends to be blazing social and mood, as well as feelings of love as a result of their dysplastic constitution, dysplastic DNA and blood type O stimulant. In order to develop a better sense of empathy, interacting with other people is the most effective method. They are motivated or enlightened by the experiences of others. They are more likely to engage in conversation with those who already have a firm grasp of the subject matter they seek to master. They select books, articles, or biographies that are relevant to them and investigate how they use the information (Hz, 2021, p.15). Poniman (2011) added that Feeling are persuasive, tolerant, affectionate, communicative and good communicators, good listeners, considerate and able to take care of other people's feelings, and sympathetic. Feelings individuals have the potential mental strength to hear the language of the heart of the other person with their power of deep breath. The Feeling type's greatest asset is its ability to enhance others' feelings. Thereafter, this personality gets to play the role of king-maker. This kind focuses on being a mentor and motivator for those they care about. As a result of their inherent calling, they prefer to help others reach their full potential. This type of galvanizer gives all they have until the point of exhaustion. Ultimately, this type is content if its cadres achieve their goals. Feeling persons are referred to as coaches because of their competence, and one of them even aspires to become the most expensive coach.

Comparable, 5) **Insting** have a balanced DNA between Adenine, Guanine, Thymine and Cytosine, a stenis physical constitution, adenine, guanine, thymine and cytosine, and their chemistry is water, therefore they tend to be happy with the social role of peace (peacemaker) and happiness. The greatest way for instinctive

people to learn is to respond swiftly and spontaneously to situations that demand knowledge. Their freedom will help them learn. They use their abilities to help others complete work that requires knowledge to be mastered (Hz, 2021). The Insting person, according to Poniman (2011), is a great spiritualist but also a fierce and temperamental individual, with sharp instincts and good prediction but doubtful and no principles (decisions easily changed) (not aggressive, confident in achieving something). This kind is also quick to respond and thorough, but less long term, honest, innocent, and naive. Moreover, Instinct people have natural desire to be happy all the time. As it is, they just like living in a place where they can be happy and not have to deal with problems. Instinct likes a peaceful and calm situation without any confrontations. If the happiness is achieved, then these people start to play a role in multitasking. They always want to help other people. Not even if they have to be number two in their partnership, this type does not really matter. What is important for this type is that it can be a partner for other types at a better level. This type does not want to be a target if they become number one. They prefer to be number two or being support system.

Meanwhile, STIFIn has been extensively researched in the context of its relation with other subjects (eg: (Amri & Rahman, 2020; Rafianti & Pujiastuti, 2017; Yandri et al., 2021). However, specifically, the relationship between STIFIn and English language acquisition and English language competence is still not widely carried out, especially between English public speaking ability and brain dominance.

At that point, in Medan, there is one university that implements the entire division-based curriculum system, which is predominantly brain-based: based on STIFIn. All classes of students are classified into groups based on the type of intelligence they possess. Students with right-brain dominance are placed in classes that are exclusively made up of right-brain people. Students with left brain dominance, on the other hand, are placed in classes that are exclusively made up of left brain individuals. This constructivist approach, which has been in place for the past two years, is designed to ensure that students receive instruction that is customized to their individual talents and interests, as theorized by STIFIn.

This institution is a vocational university that specializes in the topic of economic management. However, there are four English courses in the curriculum that begin in semesters one through four, respectively: Basic English I and II, Conversation I and II, Business English, and English for Specific Purpose. These courses are offered in the first and second semesters of each semester. These series of English subjects are taught in stages from basic to advanced levels by lecturers who have also been assessed for their brain dominance.

According to the syllabus for intermediate (namely: business English) and advanced (namely: English for Specific Purpose) courses, one of the course's outcomes is that students be able to communicate in the context of their professional life, and more specifically, public speaking. All students are taught and encouraged to develop the ability to deliver public speaking in the context of their work (e.g., corporate presentations), both in openly and digitally. Otherwise, numerous challenges arise during the teaching and learning processes of this course. Grammatical errors, pronunciation difficulties, and a dearth of vocabulary are all common problems. The issue is essentially about a single underlying issue: students' apprehension or lack of fearlessness whenever it comes to public speaking

in front of communities. Most students were afraid, frightened, and worried when required to talk in front of the class, which, according to the author's views, is a small sample of the common society. All of these issues belong to one main issue: public speaking anxiety.

Studies on speaking anxiety have been conducted since five decades ago (Tsang, 2020), which is started by McCroskey in 1977 who studied about the summary of theories and researches about oral communication apprehension. McCroskey (1977) defined communication apprehension as an individual's level of worry or anxiety in response to actual or expected conversation with another person or entities. Even though, anxiety is a crucial component in the field of language that can have both a positive and a negative impact on a person's ability to communicate effectively (Sutarsyah, 2017; Yildiz, 2021).

Public speaking anxiety, as defined in the context of public speaking, is a combination of evaluative feelings regarding one's ability to speak in front of audience (Daly et al., 1989). As an additional point of reference, Hunter et al., (2014) following the study of Bodie (2010), explained that public speaking anxiety is a situation-specific social anxiety that originates from the actual or expected enactment of an oral presentation. In practice, public speaking anxiety is the most common type of communication anxiety, and it is also one of the most extensively studied and researched communication constructs (LeFebvre et al., 2018).

Anxiety can arise in educational settings from a variety of factors, including stress, depression, exhaustion, resource constraints, and apprehension about being evaluated (LeFebvre et al., 2018). To put it in other words, students who have more competent oral communication abilities will indeed be effective in managing the anxiety that comes with public speaking situations (LeFebvre et al., 2018). Stewart et al., (2021) following the findings of Bodie (Bodie, 2010) stated that public speaking anxiety is a situation specific social anxiety that arises from the actual or anticipated enactment of an oral presentation. Increased heart rate and perspiration are common physiological responses to anxiety, while trembling, rocking, and other adaptive behaviors are also common behavioral responses to anxiety (Bodie, 2010, in Stewart et al., 2021).

Thus, paucity of empirical of research on the relationship between STIFIn and English language acquisition and competence: particularly on the relationship between English public speaking ability and brain dominance, the purpose of this research is to examine the level of public speaking anxiety among students based on the differences in intelligence machine (in thic case: STIFIn). Whether the students with Sensing, Thinking, Intuiting, Feeling, and Insting personalities have significantly different levels of anxiety or not, or even whether these brain dominant traits have no association with public speaking ability, then were explored.

Method

Participants

This study enrolled 51 students of the economic management universities in North Sumatra province. Samples were chosen from two classes of fourth semester students who took the English for Specific Purpose course on their semester credits. All of the participants went through a series of English subject on their previous

semesters, starting with Basic English I and II, English Conversation I and II, and progressing to Business English.

Instrument

This research is a case study that is qualitative in nature. The data was gathered by using a semi-structured approach. The data collected in this study was then processed using two methods: statistical calculations for quantitative data related to the results of filling out 17-question student questionnaires concerning their level of anxiety when performing a public speech, and constructive analysis for qualitative data related to the results of comparing respondents' responses.

Procedure of Data Analysis

The researcher began by taking note of the different personality traits associated with brain dominance among students that were available through the university's academic division. Following that, the researcher asked students to complete a Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (FLAS) questionnaire developed by Bartholomay & Houlihan (2016), which consisted of 17 questionnaire items to be answered on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest level of anxiety and 1 being the lowest level of anxiety (5 questions within score reversing: number 6, 7, 8, 16, and 17).

Table 1. FLAS Scale

Scale Ranging	Description
5	Extremely
4	Very
3	Moderately
2	Slightly
1	Not at all

The absolute maximum score is 5, and there are 17 questions to answer. This means that the highest maximum score is 85, while the lowest is 17. The more anxious they are, the higher their score will be. Researchers divided the 85 score into three different groups according on their recorded levels of anxiety: low (1–28), moderate (29–57), and high (57–85).

It was subsequently determined the students' experiences and involvement in public speaking, as well as their practice, depended on which brain dominant type they possess, as well as how anxious they are about speaking in front of others.

Findings and Discussion

The data from the questionnaire on students' anxiety of public speaking are presented in the table below.

Table 2. The level of public speaking Anxiety among students.

Level	Sensing		Thinking		Intuiting		Feeling		Insting	
	∑	%	∑	%	∑	%	∑	%	∑	%
High (57-85)	4	25	-	-	2	13.33	2	33.33	1	20
Moderate (29-56)	12	75	10	100	13	86.67	4	66.67	4	80
Low (1-28)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

According to the table, 25% of Sensing students have high levels of public speaking anxiety, while none of the Thinking students have high levels of public speaking anxiety. The following percentages are: 13.33% Intuiting, 33.33% Feeling, and 20% Insting students who have high levels of public speaking anxiety. On the contrary, 100% of Thinking participants found moderate levels of anxiety, followed by 80% of Insting students who also reported moderate levels.

A more in-depth analysis was completed. The entire number of responses to all of the survey questions was tallied up to arrive at the anxiety level of the participants. The table below shows the findings.

Table 3. Average level of Anxiety

Brain Dominant Type	Average level of Anxiety	Level
Sensing	49.25	Moderate
Thinking	47.50	Moderate
Intuiting	48.66	Moderate
Feeling	50.17	Moderate
Insting	51.60	Moderate

Sensing students have an average anxiety level of 49.25, while Thinking students have an anxiety level of 47.50. In contrast, Intuiting students have a degree of anxiety of 48.66, followed by Feeling students who have a level of anxiety of 50.17 on average. Insting students, on the other hand, have a higher average: 51.60. However, the majority of students in any brain dominant type are in the moderate range, not the high range, and the difference is not statistically significant. The esearcher also calculated each student's average score for each question from the replies they gathered via a questionnaire.

Table.4. Students Public Speaking Anxiety Score

Statements	Score				
	Sensing	Thinking	Intuiting	Feeling	Insting
Giving a speech is terrifying	2.50	2.30	2.80	2.67	2.20
I am afraid that I will be at a loss for words while speaking	3.00	3.20	2.80	3.17	3.80
I am nervous that I will embarrass myself in front of the audience	3.06	2.80	2.73	2.67	3.20
If I make a mistake in my speech, I am unable to re-focus	3.06	2.50	2.53	3.00	3.00
I am worried that my audience will think I am a bad speaker	3.38	3.20	3.20	2.83	4.40
I am focused on what I am saying during my speech*	2.75	2.30	3.33	2.67	1.80
I am confident when I give a speech*	3.63	3.70	3.47	3.83	3.80
I feel satisfied after giving a speech*	1.75	2.30	2.60	2.50	2.00
My hands shake when I give a	2.56	3.00	2.67	2.83	3.20

speech					
I feel sick before speaking in front of a group	2.94	2.10	2.40	3.17	2.80
I feel tremble before giving a speech	3.38	2.70	2.80	3.17	3.20
I am anxious before speaking	3.38	2.70	2.93	2.67	3.20
My heart pounds when I give a speech	3.75	3.50	3.00	2.83	3.20
I sweat during my speech	2.31	2.30	2.93	2.83	2.60
My voice trembles when I give a speech	2.19	3.00	2.40	2.83	2.80
I feel relaxed while giving a speech*	2.75	3.20	2.93	3.17	3.20
I do not have problems making eye contact with my audience*	2.88	2.70	3.13	3.33	3.20
Average	**2.90**	**2.79**	**2.86**	**2.95**	**3.04**

Nb.* Reverse score in its calculation

Thinking students have an anxiety level of 47.50, which put them as the lowest anxiety averagely among other intelligence machine, although the difference is not significant. This result is supported by the fact that the Thinking individuals always have positive mindset that they feel they can do what being target, which in this case support the emphasis of Poniman (2011). Therefore, they will perform someting as better as they can in case the Thinking type is immediately able to perform in its usual, efficient manner. They are analytical, which implies they are interested in analyzing a system's components and enjoy debating and arguing with others (Poniman, 2011). As the name suggests, the work in this category is held to a high quality in which their operation necessitates speed and accuracy. They also do not care about what other think about them, which make them making decisions without any consideration about what will people think about them.

Students at Insting intelligence machine, on the other hand, report the highest average anxiety level: 51.60, despite the fact that their apprehension is still of a medium intensity. This findings support Poniman's (2011) assertion that Insting individuals are indecisive and less convinced. To put it another way, their decisions are easily changed, as well as their lack of confidence and aggression. As a result of these variables, some people may not be confident to talk in front of the audiences, even if they are not aware of it. Despite the fact that Insting students are quick to react to a thorough question, their responses are not long-term, resulting in their being naive persons.

Moreover, according to Table 4, the statement "I am worried that my audience will think I am a bad speaker" has the highest level of anxiety across all respondents, with a score of 4.40 from Instinct students. In this circumstance, the students are extremely concerned and upset that they will be judged as incompetent speakers. This finding is consistent with Poniman's (2011) hypothesis that Instinct prefer to live in an area where they can be joyful without having to deal with problems. Instinct prefers a pleasant environment free of conflict. Consequently, they frequently avoid speaking in front of audiences in order to prevent disagreement with others. This result is in contrast to Thinking students, as their lowest anxiety level, 3.20, corresponds to Intuiting students, as Thinking

persons are unconcerned about what others think of them, leading them to make decisions without regard for what others would think.

An additional point of differentiation is found in the sentence "I am confident when I give a speech". Feeling students, on average, score 3.83 out of a possible 5.0 in this context. It is their chemistry as good communicators and good listeners that causes them to feel courageous; they are persuasive, tolerant, and affectionate; and this confirms the idea of Poniman (2011). They have the potential mental strength to hear the other person's heart language through their deep breath in which the Feeling type's greatest asset is its ability to enhance others' feelings, as well as, this personality gets to play the role of king-maker. They give all they have until they are exhausted, and they are considered as coaches as they are so excellent at what they should be doing.

Another important distinction is in the point of "I am anxious before speaking". In this circumstance, Sensing students possess the higher anxiety, where averagely they have 3.38, and "my heart pounds when I give a speech", in which averagely they possess 3.75 that make Sensing is the higher than others types. This anxiousness is in this case created by their lack of experiences, due to the fact that the students in this class, according to the author's observation, have not been consistently engaged in the real public audience making their presentations. Their potential brave tend to be expressed, in case they are brave persons, as explained by Poniman (2011), that Sensing individuals dare to attempt to maximize their existing power potential. Even when it comes to speaking up, if they have been developed through disciplined training and experience, Sensing feels most entitled to stand in the front row, despite their initial nervousness, if they push forward their main power: by employing process of trial and error. Exercises that are repeated are an efficient way to retain muscle memory, which bring the more frequently individuals train, the more muscle memory is produced, resulting in increase in this type of potential.

Conclusion

In this study, 25% of Sensing students exhibited high levels of public speaking anxiety, while none of the Thinking students did. These are the percentages: the anxiety encompasses 13.33% Intuiting, 33.33% Feeling, and 20% Insting students. Rather, 100% of Thinking participants experienced moderate anxiety, followed by 80% of Insting students.

Students in the Insting personality, on the other hand, have a higher average of public speaking anxiety: 51.60. Students who are Sensing have an average anxiety level of 49.25, whereas students who are Thinking have an anxiety level of 47.50. In comparison, Intuiting students have an average anxiety level of 48.66, while Feeling students have an average anxiety level of 50.17.

Furthermore, when it comes to the statement " "I am worried that my audience will think I am a bad speaker", Instinct students have the highest amount of anxiety among all respondents, scoring 4.40 on average. Furthermore, in the context "I am confident when I give a speech," Feeling students score an average of 3.83 out of a possible 5.0. Last but not least, when it comes to "I am anxious before speaking," Sensing students had the highest anxiety, with an average of 3.38, and "my heart pounds when I give a speech," with an average of 3.75, making Sensing the highest individuals in these circumstances.

Consider the implications, that both students and instructors need to work together to seek solutions to their anxiety-inducing situations. Quite a strategies are proposed that students could use to completely overcome the challenges for Insting students (as the most anxious), as well as to reduce the level of anxiety for other brain dominant types, such as: invariably practicing with peers, removing the fear of being giggled after giving a presentation, participating in speaking or presentation contexts, establishing friendly relationships with students, and being-mixed with high-level confidence students. Instructors can also help students overcome their anxiety by developing programs to boost their confidence, encouraging them to speak in front of an audience and not be afraid of making mistakes, involving them in English speaking programs like debating, presentation, and conversation clubs, and asking them to come prepared to class. And most importantly, the lecturers must creating and developing suitable teaching syllabus, materials, methods and techniques, appropriate with the students' individuals characteristics, personality, and intelligence machine.

References

Agung, B., & Rustandi, D. (2017). *Ini gue banget: Temukan kekuatan rahasiamu, jadilah apapun yang kamu mau*. PT. Elex Media Komputindo.

Alindra, A. L. (2018). Kajian aksiologi metode STIFIn dalam pemetaan mesin kecerdasan manusia. *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia*, *1*(1), 23–29.

Amri, M., & Rahman, U. (2020). Description of structural officers STIFIN test results of UIN Alauddin Makassar. *Lentera Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah Dan Keguruan*, *23*(1), 1–8.

Bartholomay, E. M., & Houlihan, D. D. (2016). Public speaking anxiety scale: Preliminary psychometric data and scale validation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *94*, 211–215.

Bodie, G. D. (2010). A racing heart, rattling knees, and ruminative thoughts: Defining, explaining, and treating public speaking anxiety. *Communication Education*, *59*(1), 70–105.

Boroujeni, A. A. J., Roohani, A., & Hasanimanesh, A. (2015). The impact of extroversion and introversion personality types on EFL learners' writing ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(1), 212.

Daly, J. A., Vangelisti, A. L., Neel, H. L., & Cavanaugh, P. D. (1989). Pre-performance concerns associated with public speaking anxiety. *Communication Quarterly*, *37*(1), 39–53.

Dini, J. P. A. U. (2022). Strategi pendidikan karakter anak usia dini menggunakan perangkat kepribadian genetik STIFIn. *Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, *6*(3), 1859–1872.

Fazeli, S. H. (2011). The exploring nature of language learning strategies (LLSs) and their relationship with various variables with focus on personality traits in the current studies of second/foreign language learning. *Online Submission*, *1*(10), 1311–1320.

Foroozandehfar, L., & Khalili, G. F. (2019). On the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' reading fluency, their personality types and learning styles. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *6*(1), 1681347.

Hunter, K., Westwick, J., & Haleta, L. (2014). Assessing success: A model for assessing the impact of a fundamentals of speech course on decreasing public speaking. *Communication Education*, *63*(2).

Hz, B. I. R. (2021). *Public speaking*. Yogyakarta: K-Media.

LeFebvre, L., LeFebvre, L. E., & Allen, M. (2018). Training the butterflies to fly in formation: Cataloguing student fears about public speaking. *Communication Education*, *67*(3), 348–362.

Marwa, W. S., & Thamrin, N. R. (2016). Extrovert personality and its impact on studentsâ€tm argumentative essay writing skill. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *4*(2), 267–274.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research*, *4*(1), 78–96.

Mundiri, A., & Zahra, I. (2017). Implementasi metode STIFIn dalam meningkatkan kemampuan menghafal Al-Qur'an di rumah Qur'an STIFIn Paiton Probolinggo. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam (Journal of Islamic Education Studies)*, *5*(2), 201–223.

Poniman, F. (2009). *STIFIn personality mengenali mesin kecerdasan anda.* Bekasi: PT. STIFIn Fingerprint.

Poniman, F. (2011). *Penjelasan hasil tes STIFIn: Mengenali cetak biru hidup anda*. Bekas: PT. STIFIn Fingerprint.

Poniman, F., & Mangussara, R. A. (2013). Konsep Palugada: Apa Lu Mau Gua Ada. *STIFIn Institute*.

Rafianti, I., & Pujiastuti, H. (2017). Analysis of students'mathematical power in terms of STIFIn test. *Infinity Journal*, *6*(1), 29–36.

Stewart, B., Broeckelman-Post, M., & Rossheim, C. (2021). Making a difference: A quantitative study of communication center and basic course impact on public-speaking anxiety, goal orientation, and motivation. *Communication Education*, *70*(3), 307–326.

Sutarsyah, C. (2017). An analysis of student's speaking anxiety and its effect on speaking performance. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, *1*(2), 143–152.

Tsang, A. (2020). The relationship between tertiary-level students' self-perceived presentation delivery and public speaking anxiety: A mixed-methods study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *45*(7), 1060–1072.

Yandri, H., Sujadi, E., & Juliawati, D. (2021). Perencanaan karir siswa sekolah menengah atas dengan pendekatan konsep STIFIn untuk menghadapi perilaku kapitalisme di era revolusi industri 4.0. *Educational Guidance and Counseling Development Journal*, *4*(2), 58–65.

Yildiz, M. (2021). The factors causing English speaking anxiety on non-English major academics while using English as a medium of instruction. *TEFLIN Journal*, *32*(2), 389–412.