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ABSTRACT
NEGOTIATION OF MEANING BY SECOND YEAR STUDENTS WITH EXTROVERT AND INTROVERT PERSONALITIES AT SMA AL KAUTSAR BANDAR LAMPUNG
By
Desi Rahayu

There are some factors that influence the way people negotiate the meaning, such as group arrangement, kinds of task, language proficiency, and personality. This study aimed to find out how the students with extrovert personality differ from the students with introvert personality in terms of C-Unit production and negotiating the meaning. The writer conducted the research in class XI Science 1 of SMA Al Kautsar Bandar Lampung. A set of questionnaire was used to classify the students into extrovert and introvert groups. Based on the questionnaire result, 6 students with the most extrovert personality and 6 students with the most introvert personality were taken as the subjects of this research. The data of this research were the recording of the students’ conversations while accomplishing information gap tasks in dyads arrangement.

The result showed that the extrovert students talked more often than those of the introverts. The extroverts also spent longer time in speaking and accomplished the task better than those of the introverts. In this case, the extroverts were not shy to ask for a help from others, they tended to talk to their partner when they were facing a problem in their communication through clarifying their understanding or asking for more information. On the other hand, the introvert students tended to solve the communication problems by themselves and they barely asked for help. Thus, the introverts produced a less number of C-Units than those of the extroverts.

Since the extroverts solved the communication problem by asking question to their partner, they produced a lot of signals in a communication with negotiation of meaning. Those signals produced by the extroverts, of course, were followed by a number of responses from their partner. However, in this case the extroverts produced more number of signals than the number of response. It was caused by their characteristics in which they not only were bad listener but also liked to ask questions. Meanwhile, the introverts mostly produced hesitation sounds when they were not sure about what they heard. But, their introvert partners could sense this hesitation as a signal of lack of understanding so the partners produced additional responses to help other introverts understand. Thus, introverts produced a bigger number of responses than the number of signal. In the other words, personality factors influence the way people communicate.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter concerns on: the background of the problem, the formulation of the problem, the objectives of the research, the uses of the research, the scope of the research, and the definition of terms, as follow.

1.1. Background

The aim of studying language is to interact with other. One of the ways to obtain the aim is through speaking. English teaching should focus on promoting oral skill to accommodate the students’ need for an effective communication in their second or foreign language. It is in line with what has been suggested by Hatch (1987: 63) in Mackey and Polio (2009: 2), that second language learning is developed from “learning how to carry on the conversation and learning how to communicate”. Those two learning activities can be found in an interactional conversation activity. Broadly speaking, language is best learned and taught through oral interaction.

In the process of the oral interaction, learners have the opportunity to actively elicit input which is uniquely modified for their individual circumstances. This may occur through an interactional process which is called
“negotiation of meaning”, a term first coined by Long in the early of 1980s. Besides eliciting the input, the learners also produce comprehensible output in which they modify their utterances in a conversational interaction in order to make themselves be understood by their partner in that conversation.

Through the process of the oral interaction, learners may be the recipients of corrective feedback, in its numerous forms, in response to their output (Oliver, 2009: 136). When receiving the corrective feedback, learners have an opportunity to compare the difference between this feedback and what they have produced. This process will increase their awareness of the the target language form. Therefore, it can be seen that interaction is considered as an important aspect in the second or foreign language acquisition because it provides opportunities for input, output, and corrective feedback.

In addition, Mackey and Polio (2009: 6) argue that interaction approach is compatible with other theories and approaches; i.e. personality approach, cognitive approach, and social approach. They state that personality, cognitive, and social factors affect interaction in terms of attention, input, output, and feedback which are previously mentioned as the components in oral interaction. Yufrizal (2008:116) also states that certain personality factors are important predictors of success in second language learning, one of them is extroversion and introversion.

Extroverts would suggest that they would engage in more talking and social activity in a second language and would thus learn the language better (Yu-
frizal, 2007:116). However, whether the extroverts or introverts are better language learners has been a subject of much debate. Some researchers like Dewaele and Furnham (2000) and Sidek (2012) in Kayaoglu (2013: 819) tend to associate extroversion with a better language-learning performance. Some other suggest counter evidence in favor of the introvert learners (Dörnyei, 2005 in Nezhad, 2014: 119).

In some researches in oral interaction, the aspects of miscommunication have been studied in terms of strategies used by the listener and the speaker to overcome miscommunication. The more strategies they used would likely enable them to continue the interaction. On the contrary, the less strategies they used would stop or hinder the interaction. There are two ways of looking at this phenomenon; in terms of communication strategies and negotiation of meaning. By way of communication strategies, we see how an individual learner uses strategies to manipulate his or her lack of competence. By way of negotiation of meaning, we see how two or more participants work together to overcome miscommunication.

This study looked at how senior high school students, with different personalities, work together in order to communicate in English, to overcome misunderstanding, and finally to achieve the goal of communication. According to Yufrizal (2007: 95), this could be done by looking at how students would probably produce negotiation of meaning. It is because negotiation of meaning will be an indicator of the pursuit of communication.
Based on the background of the problem discussed above, by applying information gap task in speaking class for extrovert and introvert students, it will be known whether the two characteristics of students will have different performance on their interaction. Thus, she entitles her research: “Negotiation of Meaning by the Second Year Students with Extrovert and Introvert Personalities at SMA Al Kautsar Bandar Lampung”.

1.2. Problems

In line with the background above, the researcher formulates the problems as follows:

1. How does the student with extrovert personality differ from the student with introvert personality in terms of C-Units production in each of the speech event?

2. How does the student with extrovert personality differ from the student with introvert personality in terms of signals and responses production in an interaction with negotiation of meaning?

1.3. Objectives

This study is aimed:

1. To find out how the student with extrovert personality differs from the student with introvert personality in terms of C-Units production in each of the speech event.

2. To find out how the student with extrovert personality differs from the student with introvert personality in terms of producing signals and responses in an interaction with negotiation of meaning.
1.4. Uses

Theoretically:
1. As a verification toward previous theories on the study of negotiation of meaning.
2. As an enrichment for our understanding in the aspects of oral communication and its relation with the personality factors.

Practically:
1. This study is expected to be useful for teachers to manage the students’ activity through information gap tasks.
2. As a contribution to the teachers to find the variety of speaking activities at senior high school which fits the students’ personalities.

1.5. Scope

This research will be focused on the utterances and negotiation of meaning production by the students with extrovert and introvert personalities through information gap tasks. The tasks will be given to the pair work student. There are two kinds of pairs, the first pair consists of two extrovert students and the second one consists of two introvert students. The researcher will use questionnaire to identify the extrovert and introvert students in the classroom. It will be designed for 12 students of the second year of SMA Al Kautsar Bandar Lampung for three meetings. The selection of the materials was adapted from senior high school text books which are suitable with the curriculum. The recording process will be in oral activity or students’ conversation during applying information gap tasks. The researcher will use manual coding to gain the standard transcription and to find out the students’ utterances and negotiation of meaning components (signals and responses).
1.6. Definition of Terms

In order to avoid misconception, there are some definitions of terms which are used in this research:

1. Speaking is an oral communication to build and to share the meaning in various contexts in English.

2. Information gap tasks are the activities where students are missing information necessary to complete a task or to solve a problem, and must communicate with their partner to fill in the gaps.

3. Extrovert students are those who have outgoing, friendly, sociable and talkative personality, and they will develop personal contact whenever they go.

4. Introvert students are those who have quiet and reserved personality, they show high empathy and tend to keep silent in a large group.

5. A C-Unit or Communicaton Unit is a meaningful independent utterance though not necessarily complete grammatically in one speech event.

6. Signal for negotiation of meaning is an indicator from listener that understanding is totally or partially not complete.

7. Response is the correction made by the speaker as a response to the input from listener.

8. Utterance is the action of communicating the ideas orally through sounds or words.

Therefore, this research will explain the negotiation of meaning in speaking activities through information gap tasks by the students with extrovert and introvert personalities.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter deals with some theoretical points: concept of interaction, concept of negotiation of meaning, concept of extrovert and introvert students in an interaction, and previous related studies in negotiation of meaning. These theoretical concepts are presented in the following points.

2.1. Interaction

Interaction is considered as an important aspect in the process of Second Language Acquisition. In the conversational interaction, there must be more than one person involved. According to Oliver (2009: 135), the reputed utility of interaction which is contributing to the development of second or foreign language acquisition is multifactated. During the conversational interaction, learners have the opportunity to actively elicit input which is uniquely modified for their individual circumstances. This may occur through an interactional process which is called “negotiation for meaning”, i.e. a term first coined by Long in the early of 1980s.

Through the interaction, the learners are not only attaining input but also producing comprehensible output in which they modify their utterances in order to make themselves understood. When the learners produce comprehensible output and attain the comprehensible input through interaction, their
interlanguage becomes more target-like in form (Oliver, 2009:136). Thus, through this process of interaction learners are able to test out their hypotheses about the target language.

Besides, in the process of interaction learners may be the recipients of corrective feedback, in its numerous form, in response to their output (Oliver, 2009: 136). When receiving corrective feedback, learners have the opportunity to compare the difference between this feedback and what they have produced which will increase their awareness of the form of the target language. Therefore, it can be seen that interaction is considered as an important aspect in second or foreign language acquisition because it provides opportunities for input, output, feedback, and attention to form. It might be the reason why Pica, Kanagy and Falodun (1993:56) in Yufrizal (2008:111) claim that language is best learned and taught through interaction.

Refering specifically to the role of interaction in language learning, Gass (2003: 224) in Dörnyei (2009: 117) argues that language learning is stimulated by communicative pressure in interaction. That pressure will affect the language learners either in negative or positive way depending on the tasks given to them (Dörnyei, 2009: 117). It is because the product of the conversational interaction will be a dynamic interplay among the participants in the form of verbal output which is influenced not only by the linguistic factors but also by the dynamic of the motivational tasks processing. It means that choosing the suitable tasks for the learners is important in order to make them interact with others.
Based on the explanations above, it is clear that the use of language is to express oneself to be understood by other people. Meanwhile in the process of interaction, speaking is the skill used to transfer the message to other people orally. Obviously, when the students interact, they clarify their thinking.

2.2. Negotiation of Meaning

In some research on interaction through speaking, the aspects of miscommunication have been studied in the terms of strategies used by listener and speaker to overcome the miscommunication. The more strategies they used would likely enable them to continue the interaction. On the contrary, the less strategies they used would stop or hinder the interaction. According to Bialystok (1990) in Yufrizal (2008:126), there are two ways of looking at this phenomenon; they are through communication strategies and through negotiation of meaning. By way of communication strategies, we see how an individual learner uses strategies to manipulate his or her lack of competence. In negotiation of meaning, we see how two or more participants work together to overcome miscommunication.

In speaking activity, pair work provides great exchange opportunities for communication between two students. It is because one student should interact with another one and it is more difficult for a student to remain silent or to say very little. Foster (1998:1) reports that there is a trend that dyads produce more negotiated interaction than that of the small groups. This might have been due to the limited number of people involved in that interaction. That way, those two people should work together to keep up the continuity of their interaction to accomplish the tasks. Furthermore, Krashen (1981) in Foster (1998:3) states that
the two people in dyads can provide each other with more number of comprehensible input that has been claimed to be a crucial element in second language acquisition.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that negotiation of meaning activity in pair work could give some benefits. First, pair work makes students help each other by sharing their ideas and knowledge. Second, it forces students to be more involved and more active in accomplishing the task than any other group arrangements. The last but not least, dyads arrangement stimulates students to speak more and gives more chances for them to express their ideas and clarify their thoughts orally. Thus, in this research, the students will be arranged in dyads. There will be two kinds of dyads. The first dyads consists of two extrovert students and another one consists of two introvert students.

2.2.1. Definition of negotiation of meaning

According to Foster (1998:1), negotiation of meaning is a process of checking and clarifying problems of utterances by two or more participants. Furthermore, Pica and Doughty (1988) in Yufrizal (2008:80) define negotiation of meaning as a series of exchanges conducted by addressor and addressee to help them understand and be understood by their interlocutors. From those explanations, it can be concluded that negotiation of meaning is a process of restructuring the conversation when the communication breakdown is likely to occur.

Yufrizal (2007:14) also explains how negotiation process occurs. He states that during communication exchanges in which addressees had difficulty in understanding the conversation and addressors sensed this difficulty, addressors
could restructure the conversation in order to make their input comprehensible to addressees and make the conversation continue. In this restructuring process, Yufrizal states that the addressors could do pause and question the addressees whether they understood, or simply repeat themselves verbatim or paraphrase. Looking at this process, during the process of restructuring the conversation, the people involved in the conversation will get more time to understand the message through negotiating the meaning and processing the message. Besides, this process could change the confusion into understanding and avoid communication breakdown.

It is suggested that negotiation of meaning basically consists of four interrelated moves; they are trigger, signal, response and follow-up. Pica et al (1989) provides the definitions and examples of negotiation for meaning exchanges and its elements as follows:

1. **Trigger**: Utterance followed by signals of total or partial lack of understanding.
2. **Signal**: Total or partial lack of understanding. There are some ways to express the lack of understanding, as follows:
   a. Request for confirmation through repetition
      
      
      Example: A: “It is on the right side.”
      
      B: **“On the right side?”**
   b. Request for confirmation through modification or correction
      
      Example: A: “This is not uh....this hasn’t common nature.”
      
      B: **“It doesn’t have common nature?”**
c. Request for confirmation through completion or elaboration

Example: A: “The sun...uh...sun and...”

B: “Sun rays?”

d. Request for clarification

Unlike the request for confirmation moves where the listener has partial lack of understanding, request for clarification moves indicate that the listener has total lack of understanding. Clarification request can be expressed in several ways; through WH-question and through clarification cues such as “Sorry?”, “Pardon me?”, “I don’t understand”, and so on.

Example: A: “There is a car under the tree.”

B: “Where?”

3. Response: The correction made by speaker as a response to a modification of input action by the listener (Foster, 1998:79). Response is considered as a separated aspect from signal since it is related to the reaction by the speaker to the listener’s signal. Response move consists of some components, they are:

a. Self repetition response: produced by a speaker in the form of partial or total repetition of trigger.

Example: A: “There is a zebra... you know, zebra”

B: “Deborah?”

A: “Zebra... with a z”
b. Other repetition response: the speaker repeats the signal from the listener.

Example:  
A: “The jug is between the bottle and then... the plates.”

B: “In the middle?”

A: “Yes, in the middle.”

c. Self modification response: the speaker modifies the trigger.

Example:  
A: “Maybe we use already.”

B: “Sorry, what?”

A: “We have used already.”

d. Other modification response: the speaker modifies the response based on the signal given by the listener.

Example:  
A: “The table... the shape is rounded.”

B: “You mean rounded shape?”

A: “Uh... sorry, I mean the table has rounded shape.”

e. Confirming or negating the response: it is a short confirmation or negation.

Example:  
A: “There are three causers.”

B: “What? Causers?”

A: “Yes.”
4. The last is follow-up; it is the comprehension signal and continuation moves.


1. Trigger (T)
   
   a. Confirmation check through repetition
   b. Clarification request through correction through completion

2. Signal
   
   b. Clarification request

3. Response
   
   a. self-repetition
   b. other-repetition
   c. self-modification
   d. other-modification
   e. confirm or negate the response

4. Follow-up
   
   a. explicit signal of comprehension
   b. topic continuation move

2.2.2. Functions of negotiation of meaning

Negotiation of meaning is an effective tool to measure the interaction that occurs through speaking. This is because negotiation of meaning is much more extensive when the learner is able to provide feedback on her success in understanding the speaker through providing comprehensible input and eliciting comprehensible
output. Thus, negotiation of meaning will describe the pattern of interaction among speakers to maintain communication’s flow and to avoid communication breakdown.

Negotiation of meaning affects the second language development because it covers both input and output hypothesis. Input hypothesis states that we acquire the language by understanding input that is a little bit beyond our current level of acquired competence. Then, in order to progress the language to the next step, we need to understand the input. In the process of negotiation of meaning, the speaker will modify his input so that it can be understood by the listener.

Output hypothesis also claims that the important part for progress in acquisition is that the learners should have an opportunity to produce the language through the comprehensible output. Swain is the pioneer of the research in the output hypothesis which is the important part for the progress of language acquisition. Swain (1985: 249) claims that language learners should have an opportunity to produce the target language through comprehensible output. In the interaction through negotiation of meaning, the learners have many opportunities to produce comprehensible output in the target language. It is because sometimes the learners are pushed or forced to produce the target language to respond to their partner’s misunderstanding and to clarify their own misunderstanding of the utterances or words by modifying the meaning. So it can be concluded that the interaction where there is a process of negotiation of meaning would support the target language mastery.
Furthermore, Long (1996: 27) in Yufrizal (2007:14) claims that comprehensible input is necessary for language acquisition. It means that, when interaction occurs, the learners receive understandable messages so that they can process those messages and can provide the response toward the interaction. In negotiation of meaning, this “understandable message” can be achieved through the process of modifying the utterances or restructuring the conversation. Thus, negotiation of meaning supports the development of second language acquisition.

2.2.3. Measuring negotiation of meaning that occurs in conversation

The analysis of oral language research requires the recorded speech to be segmented or divided into units. One of the approaches to segmenting the utterances is C-Unit which constitutes Communication Unit. C-Unit is defined as a meaningful utterance that provides referential or pragmatic meaning though not necessarily complete grammatically which has the following characteristics: it is under intonation of contour or a speech sound which behaves as a single segment but makes an internal transition, it is bounded by pause, and it has single semantic meaning (Crooks, 1988:5).

For example:

A : “And then... (one intonation contour) there is trees at uh ...(one pause) there is a maple tree.” (a single semantic meaning)

B : “I beg your pardon!” (a single semantic meaning)

In the example above, student A produces three C-Units that consist of one contour, one pause, and a single semantic meaning. While student B only produces one C-Unit, that is one semantic meaning.
A further definition of C-Units by Brock (1986) in Foster (1997: 8) is a unit that cannot be further divided without the dissappearance of its essential meaning. C-Units are arguably more sensitive to the transmission of meaning and more appropriate measure for an investigation of oral language (Foster, 1997: 8). Concerning on the aim of communication and interaction among learners, Yu-frizal (2008:89) states that there will be more C-Units or more meaningful unit of utterances in an activity which contains more number of negotiation of meaning. Therefore, C-Unit is adopted as a unit of measure for this research.

2.2.4. Length of speaking time in negotiation of meaning

Length of speaking time in this research is the time that the students spend to accomplish the task through the negotiation of meaning process. Length of speaking time is used in order to see the quantity of the interaction (Foster, 1998: 278) because different personalities may require different length of time to accomplish the task. The time is started when the students had understood the task and began the recording. The students are free to start the conversation and begin the recording. They stop the recording when they finish their task.

However, the length of the speaking time shows the quantity of the interaction and cannot be the sole aspect to judge the success of the students’ interaction in negotiating the meaning. It is because the students may spend a long time but they do not talk a lot to their pair. Nonetheless, the length of speaking time remains important to be investigated in the process of negotiating the meaning since it will show how much time each personality needs to resolve the difficulty in communication through negotiating the meaning.
2.2.5. Negotiation of meaning through information gap task

In an interaction through negotiation of meaning, the language learners have many opportunities to produce the target language. To provide this opportunity, the language learners must be provided with a task to be completed. A pedagogical oriented definition of task is proposed by Nunan (1993:38) in Yufrizal (2007:183). He states that task should contain a process in which the learners comprehend messages, produce and interact in the target language which focuses on the meaning rather than the form.

Yufrizal (2007:185) conducts a research to find out which of the three tasks types that will generate the greatest amount of interaction (C-Units) and negotiation of meaning (signal and response). He finds that information gap tasks produced the greatest amounts of interaction and negotiation of meaning, followed by jigsaw tasks in the second position and role-play tasks in the third position.

Information gap tasks are the tasks in which the students are given different information. In order to complete the tasks, they have to exchange the information. Through the process of sharing the information, the students are forced to negotiate the meaning because they have to make what they are saying comprehensible to others. In addition, the listeners who cannot comprehend what their partner said could request a clarification or check their understanding to their partner. That way, this task could stimulate the learners to speak and negotiate the meaning. As Courtney (1996) in Yufrizal (2007:186) finds that students in Hong Kong rated information gap tasks as the most encouraging task, followed by jigsaw and decision-making tasks.
There are five types of information gap tasks according to Long (1981:85) in Nunan (1993:50):

1. Completing the crossword

Student A have accross boxes blank, meanwhile student B have down boxes blank or vice versa. They have to complete the crossword by sharing the information. They could explain the word in their own sentences but they cannot mention the word.

2. Finding the differences

Students are distributed pictures which are similar to one another. The students have to find out the differences by asking question to each other and without showing their picture to others.

3. Completing the drawing

One student has a complete drawing and another student has the incomplete one. They should communicate to complete the drawing.

4. Discovering identical pairs

This type needs a group that consists of at least five students. Four pictures are distributed among four students and the fifth students hold a duplicate of one of the pictures. The fifth student should question the others to find which one of the four students has the the identical picture to his own.

5. Finding missing information

Two students have the same pictures but each picture has some missing items in different parts. Student A has the information needed by student B and vice versa. So, student A and B should exchange their information to complete the task.
In this research, there are two times of implementing information gap tasks. The researcher is going to use completing the crossword for those two. It is important to implement the same types of tasks since the difference of the tasks types may affect students’ interaction and the result of this research. In addition, completing the crossword is more sensitive to the transmission of the meaning since the students only concern on how to transfer the words to their partner through explaining the meaning.

2.3. Extroversion and Introversion

There are various theories claiming that certain personality factors are important in second language learning and are affecting the way people communicate in second language. Some of these factors are extroversion versus introversion. These two types of personalities can affect how people react toward the environment and might give different ways when they have to respond to the interaction by using foreign language.

2.3.1. Definition

According to Brown (1980) in Yufrizal (2008:116), an extrovert person may actually behave in an extrovert manner in order to protect his own ego with behavior of being symptomatic of defensive barriers and high ego boundaries. On the other hand, an introvert person is quieter, has more reserved behavior, and may show high empathy in reserved manner. Those two stereotypes may affect how people communicate their ideas or respond to the information in defensive or reserved manner.
Sigmund Freud is the first one who introduced the idea of extroversion and introversion as the type of personalities or individual differences. In 1923, these notions were developed by Carl Jung. According to Jung, the extroverts like social activity and excitement because these increase their level of arousal. In contrast, the introverts would prefer stay away from social situation to keep a minimum arousal level (Feist and Feist, 2010:136).

Eysenck (1965) in Feist and Feist (2010: 137) explains the typical characteristics of extroverts and introverts. He states that extroverts always crave for excitement, take chances, like changeable condition rather than static condition, are fluent in speaking, and generally are impulsive individuals. Meanwhile, the introverts are described as a retiring sort of person, quiet, prefer books to people, and have reserved and distant manner except with very intimate friends. Furthermore, he describes that the introverts tend to plan ahead, take everyday matter with a proper seriousness, and like well ordered life.

Extroversion and introversion cannot be used to judge which of the types of personalities is better than another. Extroverts might be better in social life due to their ability to communicate to other people, while introverts tend to be more reserved. However, no psychologist ever mentioned one of them as a better personality because extroversion and introversion are just the way people express themselves.

2.3.2. Personalities in negotiating the meaning

Ellis (1994) states that there are two major hypotheses about possible relationship between the dichotomy of extroversion and introversion and the process of language learning. It is argued in the first hypothesis that extroverts are more
successful language learners as they are better at basic interpersonal communication strategies. Conversely, it is claimed in the second hypothesis that introverts are better language learners as they have developed cognitive academic ability. Furthermore, Ehrman and Oxford (1989) find that extroverts favor the use of visualization strategies whereas introverts are keen to communicate meaning. Introverts are slow to initiate or to respond to a conversation because they are concerned about meaning and context.

However, extroversion and introversion are more than just an individual difference. It may affect directly to the language learning style which results in the success of language learning. Myers-Briggs typology describes an introvert students prefer to study alone with a little noise or less interruption than that of the extroverts. Moreover, introvert learners tend to participate less in the class than that of the extrovert since the introverts prefer to process ideas by thinking to themselves rather than speaking to others. In contrast, extrovert students tend to participate more in the classroom while discussing something. They like to share their ideas by talking to other people.

In case of language skills mastery, extroverts and introverts have different preference. Crow and Crow (1958) in Rivana (2013:20) state that extroverts are usually fluent in speaking, like activities in group arrangement, and can complete the tasks together with many people. Whereas, introverts are more fluent in writing than in speaking, prefer working on their own to working within the group, and need time and space to complete the task. Thus, the writer thinks that
it will be interesting to discover how extrovert and introvert students diver in communicating their ideas to others.

Skehan (1989) in Yufrizal (2008:116) cites the studies of British undergraduate students which show a fair correlation between introversion and learning success. Considering that the students also experienced English as learning a second language, the stereotype of introversion may have more outstanding result. It is supported by the fact that introvert students are fond of spending time with the books. That is the reason why introverts would likely to be more successful in learning.

But, in language acquisition the result may be different. It is because the process of acquisition is different with the process of learning. However, the writer tries to portray how the extrovert and introvert students provide comprehensible input as the speaker and elicit the output as the listener in a communication. Thus, the result will describe how the extrovert and introvert students negotiate the meaning.

2.3.3. Measuring extroversion and introversion

In order to collect the data about field of extroversion and introversion, the researcher uses questionnaire. The students will be given a questionnaire which consists of 28 items. They have 20 minutes to answer the questionnaire. It is aimed to classify them to the type of extrovert or introvert students. To avoid misinterpretation by the students, the questionnaire was translated into Bahasa Indonesia.
The questionnaire is basically measuring the level of extroversion from the students. The questions consist of positive and negative wordings which describe the characteristics of extrovert person such as does not like studying alone, big fan of parties, has many friends, talkative, and sociable.

According to personality theories, someone could be very extrovert, introvert, or in between. The questionnaire is able to classify the students to those three categories. The highest score of the questionnaire will be 112. The higher score that the students get, the more extrovert they are. A student will be categorized as an extrovert, if the student’s score is more than 71. Meanwhile, a student is an introvert if the score is lower than 56. If their scores are from 56 to 71, they are categorized as people who have a balance level of extroversion and introversion or ambivert.

2.4. Previous Studies on Negotiation of Meaning

Pica (1987) in Yufrizal (2008:96) investigates the pattern of interaction between native speaker and non-native speaker. The result shows that when non-native speakers indicate that they do not understand a message, they will express certain expression such as, ‘pardon me?, huh?, what?’ Then, the native speakers will help the non-native speaker to comprehend the message by modifying their utterances. A further research is administered by Yufrizal (2008 :102) to investigate the pattern of interaction between non-native speakers of English. He finds that the process of negotiation for meaning occured in the interaction without native speaker.
Pica, Holliday, Lewis and Morgenthaler (1989:27) apply three different tasks to investigate the patterns of comprehensible output of their subjects. The tasks are jigsaw, information gap tasks, and discussion talk. The study finds that information gap tasks offer the largest percentage of opportunities for non-native speaker to modify their output in responding to native speaker signals. Likewise, the study by Gass and Varonis (1994:24) proves that through negotiation of meaning, second language learners are able to understand the target language. Concerning with the aim of communication and interaction among learners, Yufrizal (2007:30) states that in an activity that contains more negotiation of meaning there are also more number of C-Units or meaningful units of utterances. Moreover, a study by Ellis (1994:109) finds that the negotiation of meaning will be much more extensive when the learner is able to provide feedback on her success in understanding the native speaker.

According to the finding of the research by Andayani (2010:68), there is relative different result between small group and pair work students in the terms of number of C-Units and number of signals and responses. Referring to the result of her research, she found that there are other factors that can influence students’ activity in the interaction, such as tasks types, learning styles, gender, language proficiency, and the familiarity of the students to the task.

2.5. Theoretical Assumption

Based on the definition above, the writer assumes that personalities might affect the way people negotiate the meaning. The individual differences affect learning style of the learners and influence the way they communicate their ideas to other people. Extroversion and introversion are two of some individual differences that
will have different result in sharing their thoughts, providing comprehensible input to other people and eliciting comprehensible output from other people by negotiating the meaning. Thus, the writer is interested in investigating the process of negotiation of meaning by the students with extrovert and introvert personalities.

This chapter has discussed some definitions and details that must be elaborated in this research. From the explanation above, it is clear that speaking is the skill where negotiation of meaning occurs and information gap task is the best avenue for negotiating the meaning process. Then, the writer tries to describe how the introvert and extrovert students negotiate the meaning in their interaction when the communication breakdown is likely to occur.
III. METHOD

This chapter mainly deals with the process of eliciting the data for the research. It consists of the design, the subject, the instrument, the procedures, and the data analysis. The research methodology is presented in the following points.

3.1. Design

This research is an interaction research. Crookes (1991:3) states that interaction research or interaction analysis is an analysis of language phenomena found in the interaction activities involving two or more participants. Furthermore, according to Crookes (1991:4), interaction analysis studies the process of how the participant in a communication reacts. In line with that statement, the writer was going to look at the process of an interaction that occurred when the second year students with different personalities in a senior high school were communicating in English, and what action the students did when they found difficulties in expressing their ideas.

This study used a quasi-experimental design in which this research did not apply any control group for a comparison and the participants in this study were not selected randomly but through predetermined criteria of selection. The data for this study were the recording of the students’ conversation while accomplishing a crossword puzzle. Thus, to describe the process of the
negotiation of meaning by the extrovert and introvert students, the researcher used absolute frequency and relative frequency.

3.2. Subjects of the Research

The subjects of the research were the XI Science 1 students at SMA Al Kautsar Bandar Lampung. They were in the even semester, 2014/2015 academic year. Due to the limited time and sources, the subjects recruited for this study were 12 students who were divided into 6 pairs. They consisted of 6 students with the most extrovert personality and 6 students with the most introvert personality. So, there were 3 extrovert pairs and 3 introvert pairs. It was hard to find a large number of students with very extrovert or introvert personality since there were only few students who had introvert personality. Because the concern of the research was the students’ utterances, then it was possible to use a small number of subjects.

Before choosing the class where to recruit the subjects for this research, a thorough observation was conducted to find out learners’ characteristics as the existing factors that might influence the process of interactions, for example: language proficiency, gender, age level and the background of students. It is in line with the statement from Gal et al (1999) that the subject of the interaction research will not be randomly assigned to be recorded because some predetermined criteria should be observed before doing the research. So, the class chosen for this research was expected to have a relatively the same level of language proficiency.

After conducting the observation, the researcher chose XI Science 1 class. Based on their English score during odd semester, they had a good language pro-
ficiency but they only got a few chances for speaking practice. They were at the same age level, between 16 to 17 years old. They also had the same English background since most of the students in this High School got a mandatory English course after school.

The questionnaire was administered to classify the students into groups based on their types of personality. The questionnaire which had 28 questions was distributed in the first meeting on April 21st for 20 minutes. The researcher analyzed students’ answer and scored it. Then, the students were grouped into three groups of personalities based on their score. Out of 29 students who had answered the questionnaire, 16 students were classified into extroverts, 8 students were introverts, and 5 students were ambivert or having a balance portion of extroversion and introversion. The result of the test is presented in the following chart:

*Graph 3.1 Distribution of students personality in XI Science 1 Class*

The student whose score was more than 71 was classified into extrovert group. The student whose score was less than 56 was classified into introvert
group and those whose scores were from 57 to 71 were classified into ambivert group. The extrovert student was paired with a student from the extrovert group and the introvert student was paired with a student from the introvert group. Their speaking activities were recorded while they were communicating in English to accomplish the task of crossword puzzle. Meanwhile, the speech of the students with ambivert personality was not recorded since this research only focused on analyzing the two types of personalities, namely extrovert and introvert personalities.

3.3. Instruments

The researcher got the data by using several instruments as follows:

3.3.1. Questionnaire

In order to collect the data about the field of extroversion and introversion, the researcher used questionnaire. The students were given a questionnaire which consisted of 28 items. They had 15 minutes to answer the questionnaire. It was aimed to classify them to the type of extrovert or introvert students. To avoid misinterpretation by the students, the questionnaire was translated into Bahasa Indonesia.

The researcher used the questionnaire which was previously constructed and used by Rivana (2013:42). The questionnaire consisted of 42 items. Rivana used SPSS 15 to see the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire and 14 items were dropped from the questionnaire to get more reliable set of questions. The questionnaire had Cronbach’s alpha .840 which meant that the questionnaire had been valid and reliable to use.
Another reason to choose the questionnaire used by Rivana (2013) was because there was a similarity between the present research and the one by Rivana. In 2013, Rivana investigated the differences of communication strategies used by extrovert and introvert students. Meanwhile, present research was conducted to explore the process of negotiation of meaning by extrovert and introvert students. So, it could be concluded that both of the researches tried to portray how extroversion and introversion would affect oral communication or interaction, in the term of strategies used and negotiation of meaning in order to avoid communication breakdown.

The questionnaire had 4 options for each question. It also consisted of positive and negative wordings toward the level of extroversion. The questions that had positive wordings were bolded typed. The scoring system was as follows:

- **Bolded typed**: \(a = 1, b = 2, c = 3, d = 4\)
- **Normal typed**: \(a = 4, b = 3, c = 2, d = 1\)

The questionnaire basically measured the level of extroversion from a student. The highest possible score that a student could get was 112. So, the higher score they get, the more extrovert they were. The students were classified into the extroverts if their total scores exceeded 71. Meanwhile, the students whose scores were lower than 56 were categorized as the introverts. When their scores were between 57 to 71, they belonged to ambiverts or people with a fair combination of extrovert and introvert personalities.
3.3.2. Information gap task

In eliciting the data of the students’ interaction, the researcher chose information gap tasks. This task allows students to produce more speech while accomplishing the goal of the task. In an information gap activity, one person has a certain informations that must be shared with others in order to solve a problem, to gather information or to make decisions (Neu and Reeser, 1997:4). Furthermore, Neu and Reeser state that information gap can force students to negotiate the meaning because they have to make what they are saying comprehensible to others in order to accomplish the goal of the task. Thus, the researcher chose this task to gain the maximum data of the students’ interaction in negotiating the meaning.

In this research, there were two times of implementing information gap tasks. The researcher used crossword puzzle for those two times. Crossword puzzle is a type of information gap tasks in which two students work together to complete the crossword. Student A had across boxes blank and student B had down boxes blank or vice versa. They completed the crossword by sharing the information. They could explain the word in their own sentences but they should not mention the word.

It is important to implement the same type of task since different tasks types may affect students’ interaction and the result of this research. In addition, the reason why the writer chose crossword puzzle was because completing the crossword was more sensitive to the transmission of meaning since the students only concerned on how to transfer the words to their partner through explaining the meaning. According to Dufficy (2005:65), completing crossword in information gap activity promotes optimal conditions for students to adjust their
input to each other's levels of comprehension for example by modifying the interaction. Thereby, it facilitates the optimal condition for negotiating the meaning. Thus, this type of information gap task was chosen as an instrument in this research.

3.4. Procedures

The procedures in this research consisted of four steps. They were planning, implementation, data analysis, and reporting. Each of those steps is explained as follows:

3.4.1. Planning

The planning was conducted into some steps bellows:

a. The researcher did the observation to determine English proficiency of the subject of this research. The observation was done through consulting the English teacher and the score’s record of the students.

b. The researcher prepared the material. It was required to select the appropriate tasks for the subject of this research.

c. The researcher distributed the questionnaire to the subjects of the research in order to classify them into extrovert or introvert personalities.

3.4.2. Implementation

In this step, the researcher applied the task, arranged the students into pair, and recorded their speech. There were two kinds of pairs in this research; a pair which consisted of two extrovert students or called as the extrovert pair and another pair which consisted of two introvert students or called as the introvert pair. Since
there were 12 students recruited for this research, then there were three extrovert pairs and three introvert pairs.

Furthermore, in eliciting the data by using information gap tasks, the researcher took the procedures as follows:

a. Setting up: it was designed to activate students’ interest in the topic and to give them a stake in the activity. It was done by asking the students some questions related to the topic that would be discussed.

b. Implementing the task: this was the main part of speaking activity in which the students practiced the topic introduced in the setting up. The time for a pair to complete the task was 30 to 45 minutes depending on each pair. The researcher used tape recorder to record the students’ conversation. The recording started once the students began to talk.

c. Feedback: it was the process on which the students reviewed what they had said and done and selected the ideas for further study. In this stage, the researcher asked the students to report what they had talked about.

As mentioned earlier, this research was conducted in three meetings as follows:

First meeting: observing the class to determine the subject of research and distributing the questionnaire.

Second to third meetings: recording students’ conversation when implementing information gap tasks for the extrovert and introvert pairs.
In this research, the writer did not give any treatment nor teaching activity in the classroom. Thus, the observation was done at the first meeting and the latter was directly for recording the students’ conversation.

3.4.3 Data Analysis

Skehan (1989) in Yufrizal (2008:116) cites the studies of British undergraduate student which state that the extrovert students participate more in interaction than that of the introvert students. It suggests that there might be any difference on the process of the utterances’ production by the students with extrovert and introvert personalites. Therefore, the data of this research were the number of C-Unit, signal, and response produced by the extrovert and introvert students in pair set-up. In order to describe the process of utterances’ production and negotiation of meaning (signal and response) by the extrovert and introvert students, the writer used the absolute and relative frequency.

The recording of the students’ interaction while applying information gap tasks needs to be transcribed first before being analyzed. Thus, the researcher conducted the data analysis through the following steps:

1. Transcribing and Coding System

A transcription makes the process of coding easier. The process of transcribing was checked by two raters, the researcher and the school teacher to get the standard transcription. Then, the results of the transcriptions were coded into two steps; coding for the C-Units by underlining for each C-Unit and coding for the signal and response which were coded into different colors.
Coding was represented by the following symbols:

Trigger [♦]

Signal [♥]

1. Confirmation check
   a. through repetition [♥]
   b. through modification or correction [♥]
   c. through completion or elaboration [♥]

2. Clarification request [♥]

Response [●]

1. Self-repetition [●]
2. Other-repetition [●]
3. Self-modification [●]
4. Other-modification [●]
5. Confirm or negate response [●]

Follow up [■]

The consideration of using symbols and colors for coding was because the writer used manual coding to analyze the data. In order to make the coding become clearer and understandable by the reader, the writer proposed to use symbols and colors to each aspect in negotiation of meaning that indicated each move. Trigger moves were coded by diamond [♦], signal moves were coded by heart [♥], response moves were coded by circle [●], and follow-up moves were coded by square [■].
2. Analysis

The writer analyzed the data into the following criteria:

a. C-Unit

One of the approaches to segment the utterances is through C-Units which constitutes communication units. A C-Unit is defined as a meaningful utterance that provides referential or pragmatic meaning though not necessarily complete grammatically. Furthermore, C-Unit is defined by Brock (1986) in Foster (1997: 8) as a single utterance that cannot be further divided without the disappearance of its essential meaning. In addition, Yufrizal (2008:89) states that there will be more number of C-Units in an activity which contains more negotiation of meaning. The number of C-Units in this research showed which personalities produced more number of signals and responses or more number of C-Units.

In this research, the writer coded utterances for each C-Unit by putting the underline for each C-Unit. Each C-Unit should have at least one of these characteristics proposed by Crooks (1988:5):

1. It is under one contour
2. It is bounded by pause
3. It constitutes a single semantic meaning

For example:

A : “And then... (one intonation contour) and... uh... there is trees at ...(one pause) there is a maple tree (a single semantic meaning).”

B : “I beg your pardon!”
In the example above, student A produces three C-Units that consist of one contour, one pause, and a single semantic meaning. While student B only produces one C-Unit, that is one semantic meaning.

b. Signal

Signal was measured by looking at the total or partial lack of understanding. The criteria of signal according to Pica et al (1989:16) and the coding system used in this research were explained as follows:

✔ Explicit statement or request for clarification.

Example: A: there is a car under the tree

B: where?♥

✔ Request for confirmation through repetition of speaker before.

Example: A: It is on the right side.

B: on the right side?♥

✔ Request for confirmation through modification of speaker before.

Example: A: This is not uh....this hasn’t common nature

B: It doesn’t have common nature?♥

✔ Request for confirmation through completion or elaboration of speaker before.

Example: A: The sun....uh....sun and....

B: Sun rays?♥
c. Response

As mentioned by Pica et al (1989), the response will be measured by the following criteria:

✓ Self repetition

Example: A: There is a zebra... you know, zebra♦
B: deborah? ♥
A: zebra... with a z... ●

✓ Other repetition

Example: A: the jug is between the bottle and then... the plates ♦
B: in the middle? ♥
A: Yes, in the middle.

✓ Self modification.

Example: A: maybe we use already ♦
B: in the classroom you mean? ♥
A: we have used already ●

✓ Other modification

Example: A: the table... the shape is rounded ♦
B: You mean rounded shape? ♥
A: uh... sorry, I mean the table has rounded shape ●

✓ Confirmation or acknowledgement of signal only.

Example: A: there are three causers ♦
B: what? Causers? ♥
A: yes ●
3.4.4. Reporting

This was the last step of the procedure which consisted of reporting the result or the findings.

This chapter has discussed how the research was conducted through the explanation about the design, the source of data, the instrument, and the procedures like planning the research, implementing the task, analyzing the data and reporting the result.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This final chapter offers the conclusions of the research findings and the suggestions for the teacher, students, and the next similar research.

5.1. Conclusions

Referring to the discussion of the research findings in the previous chapter, the researcher comes to these following conclusions:

1. Personality factors have a very close relation to the way people communicate and how they maintain communication. Negotiation of meaning is a process when two or more people work together to maintain their communication flow or to avoid communication breakdown. This research finds that personality factors like extroversion and introversion affect the way people speak and negotiate the meaning in the terms of giving the signals and responses.

2. People with extrovert personality tend to talk more and be expressive. Whenever they find a difficulty in understanding a message in a communication, they will ask question to others through confirming or clarifying their understanding about the message before. That way, the extroverts tend to produce more number of C-Units, signals, and responses in a communication with negotiation of meaning.
3. Feeling nervous or afraid of making a mistake in oral communication is a trademark of people with introvert personality. Moreover, it is claimed that they are too shy to openly express what they feel. Whenever they find a difficulty in understanding a message, they tend to be reluctant to ask a question. Instead of clarifying or confirming the message, the introverts choose to think by themselves. That way, they produce less number of signals in an interaction with negotiation of meaning. But, it is important to note that this phenomenon has nothing to do with their English proficiency since the students from extrovert and introvert group have almost the same level of English proficiency.

5.2. Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above, the writer gives some suggestions as follow:

5.2.1 Suggestions for the teacher

1. Teachers should be familiar with the personality of their students. Since extrovert and introvert students show a different performance in speaking activity, the teacher should ensure that students with introvert personality will be paired with those with extrovert personality. That way, the introverts would likely be motivated by the eagerness of the extroverts to accomplish the task in speaking activity.

2. Since the introvert students tend to be shy to express their thinking in speaking activity, the teacher should encourage them to take a risk in speaking and provide a suitable task that can accommodate the need of the introverts.
5.2.2 Suggestions for the students

1. Students with extrovert personality should train themselves to be a good listener to their partner while accomplishing a task in a speaking activity. It is very common when their partners had given them a series of information but the extroverts keep asking the same questions and make their partners repeat the information. Furthermore, extrovert students are a fluent speaker but they should mind their grammar and structure while speaking in order to make their language mastery perfect.

2. Students with introvert personality should train their fluency in speaking activity, not only concerning about grammar and structure but also paying attention on how to maintain the continuation of communication.

5.2.3 Suggestions for further research

1. This research has focused on negotiation of meaning in oral communication. Further research can be developed to analyze the influence of extroversion and introversion in other skills such as listening, reading, or writing.

2. The writer has used limited number of students with similar background as the subjects of the research. Further research can use a bigger number of students with various backgrounds such as level of language mastery, learning style, and so on.

3. Applied questionnaire in a different way can be a good idea. For instance, the questionnaire is given to students where they are required to give their opinion
about one particular friend. That way, there will be a small chance for them to fake their personality.
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