

ORAL COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY STUDENTS OF INTERNATIONAL CLASSES AT STATE POLYTECHNIC OF MALANG AMONG DIFFERENT PERSONALITY TYPES

Azkia Nury Farizah

English Language Teaching Study Program
Postgraduate School, Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia
Email: azkianuryfarizah@gmail.com

Abstract

Oral communication strategies are essential for a successful communication process. The purposes of this research are (1) to analyze the difference of oral communication strategies employed by Indonesian international class students across different personality types; (2) to investigate the types of oral communication strategies that Indonesian international class students mostly use; and (3) to explore the reasons why they employ such strategies. The subject of this study was 115 participants (69 introverts and 46 extroverts). The independent samples t-test result showed no significant difference between strategies employed by students of different personality types. Regarding speaking strategies, the students mostly employ (1) Message Alteration and Reduction strategies; (2) Non-verbal strategies; and (3) Negotiation for Meaning While Speaking strategies. Meanwhile, in listening, the students mostly employ (1) Word-Oriented strategies; (2) Scanning strategies; and (3) Non-verbal Strategies While Listening. Based on the interview results, learning environment factors, such as non-English major and international class, seem to contribute immensely to the use of oral communication strategies. The results indicated that students from both groups are determined to have a successful communication process by employing certain strategies to overcome problems that they encounter when communicating in English.

Keywords: Oral Communication Strategies, Personality Types, International Class

INTRODUCTION

With the introduction of communicative competence by Hymes (1972), followed by the emergence of communicative approach to language during the 1970s, the focus of EFL learning and teaching has shifted to communication competence (Demir, 2018). Canale and Swain (1980), in which later was refined by Canale himself (1983), categorized communicative competence to four components (e.g. grammatical competence, strategic competence, sociolinguistic competence and discourse competence). However, Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) proposed their own communicative competence model into five components (e.g. linguistic competence, strategic

competence, sociocultural competence, actional competence and discourse competence). It has been recognized widely that the main aim of teaching English as a foreign language is to develop students' knowledge of the language and their ability to use it in appropriate context and effective ways (Nijaradze & Doghonadze, 2005).

According to Panggabean & Wardhono (2017), speaking has been considered as the most demanding out of the four major language skills. Hence, EFL students are expected to be able to use English fluently in oral communication. As learners of English as a foreign language, students are often faced with problems in communicating and producing the target language, not to exclude students who are native speakers as well, such as struggling to deliver information and being at loss for words (Kindbom & Krohn, 2017). To be able to communicate in English successfully, EFL students need to pay attention to the intelligibility when communicating orally (Yamaguchi, 2002). To cope with these problems, students often apply different communication strategies in different classroom activities such as panel discussion (Rosiana, 2018), task-based learning (Rohani, 2014), classroom presentation (Panggabean & Wardhono, 2017) and other forms of speaking assessment.

Nakatani (2006) characterizes oral communication strategies as strategies which "specifically focus on oral interaction and interlocutor's negotiation behavior for coping with communication breakdowns." (p. 79). Supported by previous research about how learners' communicative skills can be improved by developing strategies for communication (Cohen, Weaver, & Li, 1996; D'ornyei, 1995), Nakatani (2006) developed his own oral communication strategies inventory (OCSI) which contains 8 categories of strategies for coping with speaking problems and 7 categories for coping with listening problems during communication. The instrument was tested on EFL students including the reports on Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) by Oxford, which was later being compared with the result of his inventory. The results showed that students with high oral proficiency levels tend to use specific strategies when they do oral communication.

Apart from proficiency, previous studies have also revealed that different personality types affect the use of language learning and communication strategies. A research by Tarone (1977) implied that personality types affected the use of communication strategies. Interestingly, Balgiu and Adir (2013) found that, in communicating, adjusting the message according to one's personality traits have a significant impact on the success of the communication itself. Some studies showed that there is a significant correlation between students' personality types and speaking performances (Nadzif, 2015) as well as significant differences in their listening skills (Muharrami, Setiyadi & Hasan 2019). However, several studies also implied that there

are no significant difference between speaking strategies employed by students of different personality types (Marpaung, 2019) or their speaking abilities (Rahmawati & Nurmayasari, 2016). Therefore, further research needs to be conducted to explore the use of communication strategies by EFL students across different personality types, which in this case, students at international classes who are taught and interact using English on a daily basis.

Yu and Moskal (2018), as cited in Friedman (2019), stated that international education provides educational, cultural and linguistic value to their students, which is expected to result in cultural understanding and readiness to interact in a global environment. Benitez (2019) also mentioned four key mechanisms that are substantial in conducting international education practices such as university rankings, cooperation, academic mobility, and curricular reforms. The Indonesian government has initiated the internationalization of higher education to improve and raise the quality standard of education in Indonesia by establishing partnerships with foreign universities through double degree programs (Soejatminah, 2019).

De Wit and Hunter (2015) redefined a previous statement by Knight (2004) regarding internationalization as "an intentional process undertaken by higher education institutions in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society" (p.3). Arfani and Nakaya (2019) found that most Indonesian parents and students are optimistic about how international education would help students in character development (self-confidence) and successful careers in the future. The use of oral communication strategies by students of international classes might be different than those in regular college classes. Oftentimes, the majority of university international programs in Indonesia only accept applicants with a specific range of English proficiency levels since these schools require their students to use English textbooks and communicate using English on a daily basis. However, this does not rule out the possibility of different communication strategies employed by Indonesian students of international classes across different personality types.

Based on the background of study above, there are not many studies about oral communication strategies employed by university students in Indonesia, let alone studies conducted in international classes across the country. Students in international classes, with English proficiency levels of intermediate and above, might employ different oral communication strategies compared to students in non-international classes since they have to interact with their classmates and teachers using English on daily basis. Besides, several studies indicated that there is a significant difference between communication strategies employed by extraverted and introverted students. Moreover, regarding previous studies about oral communication strategies that have

been mentioned before, the majority of them did not include an interview session to get a deeper understanding about students' motivation in using such strategies. On that account, this study would try to fill the gap in exploring the employment of oral communication strategies by students of different personality types at international classes in State Polytechnic of Malang using a mixed-method approach, including both questionnaire and interview results analysis. This study is expected to give advantages and benefits for both EFL teachers and learners regarding the use of various strategies employed by students across their personality types, specifically students at international classes, when they do oral communication. Therefore, this study was conducted to (1) analyze the difference of oral communication strategies employed by Indonesian international class students across different personality types, (2) investigate the types of oral communication strategies that they mostly employ and (3) explore the reasons why they make use of such strategies.

METHOD

This research is a survey study with a mix-method approach, employing both quantitative and qualitative analysis through questionnaire and interviews. A quantitative approach was employed to analyze questionnaire results. Meanwhile, interview results were analyzed using a qualitative approach. The use of concurrent triangulation strategy which employs both quantitative and qualitative approaches could cover and answer a broader range of research questions, utilize the strengths and overcome the weaknesses of each approach, improve the understanding of the data that might be missed when using a single approach, increases the validity of the results and provide strong evidence for the conclusions (Atif & Richards, 2013).

The participants of this study were 115 Indonesian undergraduate students from State Polytechnic in Malang with the age range of 18-20 years old. The study was conducted in five International classes from two different majors (Accounting Management and Business Administration). This study uses three types of instruments: (1) Oral Communication Strategies Inventory; (2) Myers-Briggs Type Indicator; and (3) Interview. Oral communication strategies inventory (OCSI) by Nakatani (2006), which covers both speaking and listening strategies, were used to identify the strategies employed by the students.

Before handing out the questionnaire, a preliminary study was conducted with the total of 40 students in order to try out the questionnaire. A reliability test for each speaking and listening factor was done to indicate less relevant questions based on the students' answers. The process resulted in 9 deleted questions from the questionnaire. Subsequently, a try out test for the questionnaire was conducted with Cronbach alpha values of 0.836 for the speaking section and 0.887 for the listening section.

The MBTI instrument used for this study was a simplified version of the original instrument retrieved from Wedgworth Leadership Institute (2016). The self-report questionnaire consists of 50 forced-choice questions related to personalities, preferences and decisions in various situations. Individual interviews with two of the students were conducted by asking questions regarding the strategies that they use when they have to communicate orally in English classrooms.

The interviewees were chosen based on the highest scores from the questionnaire result which indicated that the students employ oral communication strategies more often compared to their peers. The interview was semi-structured with predetermined questions related to: 1) What type of communication strategies mostly used; 2) Why do they employ such strategies; and 3) How to implement them in real-life context. The students were asked to tell stories about their experiences in communicating in English, the problems that occurred, which strategies that they used, and how to implement such strategies to maintain a successful communication process with their interlocutors. The results of the interview were coded and analyzed using thematic analysis.

To obtain the data, the students were handed out two types of questionnaires: MBTI personality test and OCSI questionnaire regarding communication strategies that they use during speaking activities. After inquiring the MBTI questionnaire results, the students were divided into two groups: (1) Introverted learners (69 students) and (2) Extroverted learners (46 students). To validate the results of the questionnaire, interviews with some of the students were conducted after obtaining the results from OCSI questionnaire. The interviewees were selected from each personality group and were asked questions regarding communication strategies that they use based on their questionnaire answers.

The data analysis process was divided into three parts to find: (1) Statistical differences between two groups using independent-samples t-test; (2) Most employed oral communication strategies between two groups using descriptive statistics; and (3) Coded interview results regarding the use of strategies by students of different personality types using thematic analysis. After acquiring the data, the researcher analyzed the questionnaire result using IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics to obtain the most used strategies by the both groups and an independent-samples t-test to determine the significant difference between students of different personality types. The results of the interview were analyzed using a qualitative approach to gain a deeper analysis and understanding about the results. Selected interviewees from each personality group were asked questions regarding their answers in the questionnaire, such as what strategies that they employ most often, reasons of why they chose such strategies and how they implement them in real-life situations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Oral Communication Strategies Questionnaire Results

After obtaining the data from the MBTI questionnaire, the students were divided into two groups: (1) Extrovert Group (46 students); and (2) Introvert Group (69 students) using the MBTI scoring sheet. Subsequently, the answers from the OCSI questionnaire were categorized into a total of 15 factors (8 factors for speaking strategies and 7 factors for listening strategies), and the total sum of individual answers for each factor were calculated. With a total of 115 valid data, an independent-samples t-test was calculated using SPSS to compare the mean between the two independent groups. The results could be seen in the tables below:

Table 1 Statistics for Extrovert and Introvert Groups.

	Groups	N	Mean	Std.	Std. Error
				Deviation	Mean
Results	Extroverts	46	185.74	22.584	3.330
	Introverts	69	192.70	21.818	2.627

Table 2 Independent Samples T-Test Result.

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Results	Equal variances assumed	.032	.859	1.652	113	.101	-6.957	4.212	-15.300	1.387
	Equal variances not assumed			1.640	94.269	.104	-6.957	4.241	-15.377	1.464

Table 2 displays a significant value (2-tailed) of 0.101 (equal variances assumed) which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, there is no significant difference between oral communication strategies employed by the Extrovert ($\bar{x}$ = 185.74, SD = 22.58) and Introvert ($\bar{x}$ = 192.70, SD = 21.82) groups. Both groups tend to employ similar strategies in speaking and listening, which would be analyzed in the next section of the discussion using descriptive statistics to find the most used strategies by both groups.

Numerous studies related to personality types and communication strategies have been conducted throughout the years with comparatively different results. Several

studies implicated that there is a significant correlation between personality types and language learning strategies (e.g. Muharrami, 2019; Nadzif, 2015; Hanafiyeh, 2017) as well as Oral Communication strategies (Azmei & Liyana, 2013) employed by EFL students. Meanwhile, the rest of the studies indicated that there is hardly a difference between language learning strategies (e.g. Nikoopour & Farsani, 2010; Marpaung, 2019) and speaking strategies (Mutlu, 2018) employed by students of different personality types, which has been found in this study as well. Based on the findings and analysis result, both extroverted and introverted students have similar preferences in employing oral communication strategies. Students of both groups tend to alter and reduce the message that they want to deliver in order to avoid communication breakdown and pay attention to individual words that are uttered by their interlocutor.

According to Brown (2000), extroversion has a significant influence in second language acquisition. He stated that extroverted students are more willing to participate in class activities compared to introverted students. Dornyei (2005) suggested that introverts tend to be passive, quiet and reserved, meanwhile extroverts are sociable, active, and talkative. In this case, both students of personality types might employ similar communication strategies, but have different approaches in utilizing them in real life. These statements support the results of the interview.

Similarly, Zafar and Meenakshi (2012) in Abdallah, El-Hilaly & Sheir (2015) stated that extroverted language learners tend to make use of the opportunity in communicating using the language that they have learnt since they are typically more talkative and active in joining group activities compared to introverted language learners. Thus, despite of similar communication strategies that they chose to employ, students from both groups have different methods of utilizing the strategies in the practice. Even though in the present study personality types do not quite influence the use of oral communication strategies among EFL students of international classes in State Polytechnic of Malang, other factors such as motivation, interest, proficiency, and learning styles might have significant differences to the use of oral communication strategies.

Speaking Strategies Employed by Extroverted and Introverted Students

After analyzing the data to find significant differences between two groups, the results for each factor related to speaking and listening were analyzed to find the most used strategies by both personality groups using descriptive statistics. The mean for each factor was calculated to find out the most employed strategies from both groups. The results show that the students have similar preferences in choosing strategies for speaking and listening.

Table 3 Speaking Strategies Employed by Extroverted Students

	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Message Reduction and Alteration	46	2.50	2.50	5.00	192.50	4.1848	.76998
Non Verbal Strategies	46	2.50	2.50	5.00	192.00	4.1739	.69296
Negotiation For Meaning	46	2.25	2.75	5.00	185.00	4.0217	.66422
Social Affective	46	3.00	2.00	5.00	180.60	3.9261	.67377
Fluency Oriented	46	2.40	2.60	5.00	176.40	3.8348	.55985
Attempt to Think in English	46	3.00	2.00	5.00	168.50	3.6630	.87594
Accuracy Oriented	46	2.75	2.25	5.00	157.00	3.4130	.65451
Message Abandonment	46	4.00	1.00	5.00	127.90	2.7804	.84817
Valid N (listwise)	46						

Table 4 Speaking Strategies Employed by Introverted Students

	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Message Reduction and Alteration	69	3.00	2.00	5.00	290.00	4.2029	.74911
Non Verbal Strategies	69	2.50	2.50	5.00	276.50	4.0072	.72504
Negotiation For Meaning	69	3.00	2.00	5.00	276.00	4.0000	.71486
Social Affective	69	2.60	2.40	5.00	268.00	3.8841	.62158
Attempt to Think in English	69	4.00	1.00	5.00	263.50	3.8188	.78108
Fluency Oriented	69	3.60	1.40	5.00	255.80	3.7072	.68219
Accuracy Oriented	69	3.75	1.25	5.00	228.75	3.3152	.79480
Message Abandonment	69	4.00	1.00	5.00	212.64	3.0817	.85844
Valid N (listwise)	69						

The most used speaking strategies by both Extrovert and Introvert groups were Message Reduction and Alteration strategies (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 4.18$, $SD = 0.77$; Introvert: 4.20 , $SD = 0.75$) which relate to reducing the original message and using simple words to avoid communication problems. The second most used speaking strategies are Non-Verbal strategies (Extrovert $\bar{x} = 4.17$, $SD = 0.6$; Introvert $\bar{x} = 4.01$, $SD = 0.73$) which relate to how the students use gestures and eye contact to express what they want to say when they are not able to utter the sentences in English. Negotiation for Meaning while Speaking (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 4.02$, $SD = 0.66$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 4.00$, $SD = 0.71$) were the third most used strategies by both Extrovert and Introvert groups in which represent how the students try to maintain the interaction by compromising with the listeners. Other strategies were also employed quite often by the students such as Social Affective strategies (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.92$, $SD = 0.67$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 3.88$, $SD = 0.62$),

Fluency-oriented strategies (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.83$, $SD = 0.56$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 3.70$, $SD = 0.68$), and Attempt to think in English (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.66$, Introvert: $SD = 0.87$). The least used strategies by both groups were Accuracy-Oriented strategies (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.41$, $SD = 0.65$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 3.32$, $SD = 0.79$) that relate to the determination to speak English accurately, followed by Message Abandonment strategies (Extrovert $\bar{x} = 2.78$, $SD = 0.85$; Introvert $\bar{x} = 2.78$, $SD = 0.85$) which relate to giving up when they find problems in communicating and leaving the message unfinished.

In order to get a deeper understanding of the data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with one respondent from each group. The first respondent was a male student from the Extrovert group. When asked about problems that he often encounters when speaking in English, the student pointed out about how sometimes he struggles to find the right word when he interacts in English. He stated that he overcomes such problems by altering the message using simple words without reducing his original message.

Other strategies that he employs were non-verbal strategies while speaking such as using facial expressions and gestures to replace words that he is not able to utter. He is also confident in taking initiation, dares to take risks while communicating, pays attention to the listener's reaction and is willing to repeat his speech until the listener understands his intention. However, he rarely uses fluency-oriented strategies and attempts to think in English strategies since he stated that he mostly constructs the sentences that he wants to utter in his native language first.

The second respondent was a female student from the introvert group. Similar to the first respondent, she stated that sometimes, when she cannot express what she wants to say in English, she employs message alteration and negotiation for meaning while speaking by describing and giving examples of what she wants to say. However, in contrast to the first respondent, instead of trying to construct the sentence in her native language, the student attempts to think in English when communicating in English. She also stated that it is important to pay attention to grammatical accuracy in order to convey the message successfully. However, she does not consider fluency-oriented strategies as essential as simplifying words to give her interlocutor a better comprehension of the conversation context.

According to Nakatani (2006), message reduction and alteration strategies are employed by using simple words and familiar expressions with the same meaning to reduce the difficulty of the original message in order to make it easier for the listener to grasp. Bialystok (1990), in Nakatani (2006), stated that EFL students tend to employ these strategies because they do not want to take risks in using new words that may cause a communication breakdown. It is confirmed by students' statements from introverted and extroverted groups regarding how they found this particular strategy

as one of the most useful strategies when they face difficulties in delivering the message in English. By simplifying words and using similar expressions, they found it easier to communicate with their interlocutor and increase the chance of a successful message delivery process.

The second strategy that they found useful was related to nonverbal strategies while speaking (e.g. gestures, facial expressions, eye contacts or hints to make it easier for the listener to understand what they intend to express). The students stated that expressing what they have in mind using nonverbal strategies could help them avoid failures in communicating using English. The third strategy that the students mostly use is negotiating for meaning while speaking. Students stated that when they find their interlocutors having difficulties in understanding what they are saying, they do not hesitate to repeat the message until the listener understands their intentions. They also try to check the listener's comprehension in order to avoid communication breakdown. According to Nakahama, Tyler and Lier (2001) such strategies are essential for EFL students to improve their English skills. Lee (2000) also stated that negotiation while communicating could be conducted by reaching an agreement in resolving a problem while focusing on the purpose of the language rather than to practice language forms.

Students from extroverted and introverted groups tend to avoid using message abandonment strategies. According to previous research (Chen, 2009; Yaman, Irgin & Kavasoğlu, 2013; and Ounis, 2016), this strategy is usually employed by students of lower proficiency levels. When encountering issues in delivering the message, students from both groups do not give up and leave the conversation unfinished. They stated that they keep attempting until the listener understands their intentions. Dornyei and Scott (1997) also labeled this strategy as a negative strategy while speaking.

In general, both students from extroverted and introverted groups stated that they prefer to deliver the main idea of the topic when they converse with their classmates, especially with students from different countries. They also stated that the strategies that they mostly employ such as message reduction and alteration strategies, non-verbal strategies while speaking and negotiation for meaning while speaking have helped them in interacting with their classmates during group projects and other class activities. Since students in international classes are required to use English when interacting with the teacher and their classmates, they appeared to be more motivated in having a successful communication process. Thus, they try to minimize the risk of failure in the communication process by using simple words, gestures, facial expression, and asking questions when they do not grasp what the speakers are saying. This suggests that the learning environment, in this case an international class, has a major influence on strategies that the students prefer to use.

Listening Strategies Employed by Extroverted and Introverted Students

Regarding listening strategies, seven variables related to strategies to cope with listening problems were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The results for both extroverted and introverted groups could be seen in the tables below:

Table 5 Listening Strategies Employed by Extroverted Students

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Word Oriented	46	3.00	2.00	5.00	187.50	4.0761	.69256
Scanning	46	2.25	2.75	5.00	184.75	4.0163	.62672
Nonverbal Strategies	46	3.00	2.00	5.00	182.50	3.9674	.81242
Negotiation for Meaning	46	3.75	1.25	5.00	178.25	3.8750	.73551
Getting the Gist	46	3.00	2.00	5.00	174.60	3.7957	.83930
Less Active Listener	46	3.50	1.50	5.00	170.50	3.7065	.83384
Fluency Maintaining	46	2.50	2.50	5.00	164.25	3.5707	.58610
Valid N (listwise)	46						

Table 6 Listening Strategies Employed by Introverted Students

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Word Oriented	69	2.70	2.30	5.00	285.10	4.1319	.62697
Scanning	69	2.50	2.50	5.00	279.50	4.0507	.58564
Nonverbal Strategies	69	2.50	2.50	5.00	268.70	3.8942	.63729
Negotiation for Meaning	69	4.00	1.00	5.00	266.25	3.8587	.73948
Getting the Gist	69	3.00	2.00	5.00	261.30	3.7870	.62448
Less Active Listener	69	4.00	1.00	5.00	257.50	3.7319	.80704
Fluency Maintaining	69	3.25	1.75	5.00	240.00	3.4783	.65409
Valid N (listwise)	69						

Both Introvert and Extrovert groups mostly employ Word-Oriented strategies (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 4.08$, $SD = 0.69$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 4.13$, $SD = 0.62$) while listening which relate to paying detailed attention to individual words, followed by a similar factor, Scanning strategies (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 4.01$, $SD = 0.62$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 4.05$, $SD = 0.57$), in which relate to focusing on a particular part of speech. The third most favored strategies are Non-verbal Strategies While Listening (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.97$, $SD = 0.81$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 3.89$, $SD = 0.64$), which relate to how the students take notice in the listener's eye contact, facial expressions and gestures. Negotiation for Meaning While Listening (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.88$, $SD = 0.74$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 3.78$, $SD = 0.62$), Getting the Gist (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.79$, $SD = 0.84$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 3.79$, $SD = 0.63$) and are also profusely employed by the both extroverted

and introverted students. Meanwhile, the least employed strategies by the students are Less active Listener (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.71$, $SD = 0.83$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 3.73$, $SD = 0.80$), which relate to negative strategies while listening, and Fluency-Maintaining strategies (Extrovert: $\bar{x} = 3.57$, $SD = 0.59$; Introvert: $\bar{x} = 3.47$, $SD = 0.65$).

Most students from both groups employ word-oriented strategies while listening which means that students tend to focus on individual words in order to understand the speaker's speech. The students employ this strategy by guessing the speaker's intention through individual words and interrogative sentences. Nakatani (2006) argued that this strategy may induce problems when students are relying too much on specific parts of speech which affects their understanding.

However, in a research conducted by Rachmawati (2015) among 692 first grade students in faculty of economics and business; law, and engineering at Brawijaya University Malang, non-English major students tend to pay attention to new vocabulary or expression, imitate the pronunciation of new words and expressions, and comparing different expressions use in certain situations. She also stated that the learning materials provided by the teachers are mostly related to practicing communication skills which might have influenced students' preferences in using those strategies to be able to communicate proficiently in English. Thus, the result supported the analysis of this study. Both extroverted and introverted students mostly focus on individual words that they think are important in communicating as well as acquiring new vocabulary. Students also appeared to focus on spotting important parts of speech and expressions used by the speaker.

Students from Non-English Major, in this case Business Administration and Accounting Management, mostly use English for Specific Purposes rather than General English in the classroom. According to Hans and Hans (2015), ESP refers to English for specific fields of study that are relevant to the learners (e.g. Science, Business, Medical, etc.), which means that students are able to use the English in school or work-related situations with specific contexts. Therefore, the list of words that they have to understand and use in the classroom are different compared to students English major. Based on the interview result with the extroverted student, when encountering a problem when communicating with the teacher during a lecture about a new mathematics term that he did not understand, he did not hesitate to ask for help and further explanation from the teacher. This result implicated that the use of ESP in the classroom also played a significant role in influencing strategies employed by the students such as word-oriented and scanning strategies.

The second most employed strategies is scanning strategy. Students tend to pay attention to particular parts of speech, such as subject, verb, the interrogatives uttered

by the speaker. This strategy is almost similar to the previous listening strategy that they mostly employ. Meanwhile, the third most used strategy is non-verbal strategies while listening. The students were found to employ non-verbal strategies while listening such as paying attention to the speaker's eye contact, gestures, and facial expressions in order to grasp the message uttered by the speaker. In a similar research by Mirzaei and Heidari (2012) among female students and male students of different proficiency levels, female participants tend to use non-verbal strategies and word-oriented strategies while listening which supports the result of this study with mostly female participants from both personality groups.

Students from both groups tend to avoid less active listener strategy related to not wanting to take risks in guessing the speaker's intention and thinking in English. Interestingly, students rarely employ fluency-maintaining strategy such as paying attention to the speaker's rhythm, intonation and pronunciation. According to the interview results, students from both groups stated that as important it is to pay attention to those factors, they try to focus more on the successful delivery of the message. They also added that as long as they understand the speaker's intention, such factors are less essential in the communication process.

Regardless of different preferences in choosing certain strategies for particular situations, both students mostly employ similar strategies in speaking and listening. They refuse to leave the message undelivered and try their best to have a successful communication process supported by their statements regarding how they find various strategies useful for different types of situations. Therefore, the interview results supported and confirmed the results of OCSI questionnaire regarding the use of oral communication strategies by both extroverted and introverted students. Overall, students from both groups try their best in comprehending the speech meaning and refuse to ignore the message delivered by their interlocutor.

CONCLUSION

The study was conducted to see the differences between strategies employed by extroverted and introverted students in an international class setting. The results of the questionnaire indicated that there was no significant difference between strategies employed by extroverted and introverted students. In conclusion, both introverted and extroverted students mostly try to maintain an effective communication process by using various oral communication strategies in order to cope with problems that they encounter while communicating in English. The majority of the students are willing to negotiate and ask the interlocutor to repeat their message.

These findings were confirmed by the interview results which indicated that the students use such strategies in order to prevent a communication breakdown. In deciding which strategies to use, both introvert and extrovert groups tend to choose

strategies that are most effective and applicable for them regardless of their personality traits and manners in socializing. Thus, personality types do not affect the preference of oral communication strategies, even though students of different personality types have different methods of implementing such strategies in real-life context. Besides, the learning environment (e.g. international class and non-English major class) seem to contribute tremendously to the use of oral communication strategies in classroom settings.

While the research has provided the results of oral communication strategies among international class EFL students among different personality types, other factors such as learning styles, proficiency levels and students' motivation might contribute immensely to the use of oral communication strategies. Therefore, a further research about oral communication strategies across various contributing factors needs to be conducted. Considering the limitation of time and the pandemic situation, the number of the respondents, both for the survey and interview process, were considered small. Thus, in conducting future research, it would be more advantageous to have a large population size of the research subjects. The use of oral communication strategies is essential to overcome problems when communicating in English. Moreover, EFL students are encouraged to make use more of oral communication strategies in order to have a successful and effective communication process.

REFERENCES

- Abdallah, R. H., El-Hilaly, A. R., & Sheir, A. A. (2015). Personality Types as Predictors of Oral Fluency. *Educational Science Journal*, 23(3), 25-57.
- Arfani, J. W., & Nakaya, A. (2019). Meanings of International High School Education in Indonesia and Japan. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 18(3), 310–325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240919890223>
- Atif, A., & Richards, D. (2013). A Student Retention Model: Empirical, Theoretical and Pragmatic Information Systems: Transforming the Future (24th Australasian Conference on Information Systems, 4-6 December 2013). Conference Paper. Australasian Conference on Information Systems, Melbourne.
- Azmey & Liyana. (2013). Investigating Personality And Communication Strategies Used By ESL Learners. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Faculty of Education. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia.

- Balgiu, B. A., & Adir, V. (2013). Communication and Personality. The Importance of Building Messages According To Personality Traits. *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, 8(4), 28.
- Benitez M. (2019). How Is Academic Culture Influenced by Internationalization?. *International Higher Education*. 97, 10-12.
- Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication Strategies: A psychological Analysis of Second Language Use*. London: Blackwell.
- Brown, D. H. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning & Teaching* (4th edition). New York: Longman.
- Canale, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In J. C. Rithards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.). *Language and communication*. New York: Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Z. Dornyei, S. Thurrell 1995. Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5-35.
- Chen, H. W. (2009). *Oral Communication Strategies Used by English Major College Students in Taiwan*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Chaoyang University of Technology, Taichung, Taiwan.
- Cohen, A. D., Weaver, S. J., & Li, T.-Y. (1998). *The Impact of Strategies-Based Instruction on Speaking a Foreign Language*. Essex, England: Longman.
- De Wit, H., and Hunter F. (2015). The Future of Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe. *International Higher Education*. 83, 2–3.
- Demir, Y. (2018). Exploring the Oral Communication Strategies Used by Turkish EFL Learners: A Mixed Methods Study. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11237a>
- Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the Teachability of Communication Strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55–85.

- Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47, 173-210. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.51997005>
- Fretwell, C.E, Lewis, C.C, Hannay, M. (2013). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, A/B Personality Types, and Locus of Control: Where Do They Intersect?, *American Journal of Management*, 13 (3), 57-66.
- Friedman, C. (2019). *Learning Barriers in International Education*. South Korea: The Graduate School of Namseoul University.
- Hanafiyeh. M. (2017). The Relationship between HEXACO Personality Traits and Iranian EFL Learners' Speaking Abilit. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Research*. 5(19), 61-77.
- Hans, A., & Hans, E. (2015). A Comparative Study of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English as a Second Language (ESL) Programs. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 3(11), 26-31.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In Pride, J. B., & Holmes, J. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, (p. 269-293). Baltimore, USA: Penguin Education, Penguin Books Ltd.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung: Vol. 6. Psychological types* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.) (H. Read et al., Eds.). Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400850860>
- Khalil. R. (2016). Influence of Extroversion and Introversion on Decision Making Ability. *International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences*. 14(5). 1534-1538. 10.18203/2320-6012.ijrms20161224.
- Kindbom, C., & Krohn, M. (2017). *Oral Communication Strategies in English as a Foreign Language*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Linköping University.
- Lee. L (2000). Online Interaction: Negotiation of Meaning and Strategies Used Among Learners of Spanish. *ReCALL*. 13(2). 9-66.

- Marpaung, D. (2019). EFL Learners' Big Five Personalities, Language Learning Strategies, and Speaking Skills. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*. 5(1). 73-96. eISSN: 2503-4197, pISSN: 2527-5070
- Mirzaei, A. (2012). Exploring the Use of Oral Communication Strategies by (Non) Fluent L2 Speakers. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL*, 9(3), 131–156.
- Muharrami, M. L. (2013). A Comparative Study between Introvert and Extrovert Students Personality in Listening Achievement. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*. 2(8).
- Mutlu, V. (2018). Relationship of Personality Types and Strategy Choices in Foreign Language Learning. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 13(1), 146–163.
- Myers, I., & McCaulley, M. (1985). *Manual: A Guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists.
- Nadzif, M. F. (2015). The Correlation between Extroversion and Speaking Skill in English Education Department Students. Unpublished Thesis. Walisongo State Islamic University, Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia.
- Nakahama, Y., Tyler, A., & Lier, L. V. (2001). Negotiation of Meaning in Conversation and Information Gap Activities: A comparative discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*. 35, 377–405.
- Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an Oral Communication Strategy Inventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(2), 151-164.
- Nijaradze, N., & Doghonadze, K. (2005). Teaching Oral Communication Strategies (Higher Education New Technologies and Innovation Conference). Conference Paper. Akaki Tsereteli State University, Kutaisi, Georgia
- Nikoopour, J. & Farsani, M. A (2010). On The Relationship between Language Learning Strategies and Personality Types among Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of English Studies*, 1(1), 81-101.
- Ounis, T. (2016). Exploring the Use of Oral Communication Strategies by High and Low Proficiency learners of English : Tunisian EFL students as a case study. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 1077–1098.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York, NY: Newbury House/Harper & Row.

- Oxford, R. L. (1996). Employing a Questionnaire to Assess the Use of Language Learning strategies. *Applied Language Learning*, 7, 25–45.
- Panggabean, C. I. T., & Wardhono, A. (2017). Communication Strategies Used By EFL Students in Their Presentation. *Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics and Literature*, 3(2), 39–54.
- Rachmawati, D. (2015). Language Learning Strategy Adopted by Non-English Department Students in Learning English for Specific Purposes. *Lingua Scientia Language Journal (JBLS)*, 7(1), 25–37.
- Rahmawati, S. & Nurmayasari, E. (2016). A Comparative Study between Extroverted and Introverted Students and Their Speaking Ability. *English Journal UIKA Bogor*, 15(2), 20-29.
- Rohani, S. (2014). Positive versus Negative Communication Strategies in Task-Based Learning. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(2), 311–312.
- Rosiana, E. (2018). Communication Strategies Employed By EFL Learners across Their Proficiency Levels During Panel Discussion In Speaking Class. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Malang.
- Soejatminah, S. (2009). Internationalization of Indonesian Higher Education: A Study from the Periphery. *Asian Social Science Journal*. 5(9).70-78.
- Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious Communication Strategies in Interlanguage: A Progress Report. *TESOL*, 77, 194-203.
- Yamaguchi, Ch. (2002). Towards International English in EFL Classrooms in Japan. *The Internet TESL Journal*. 8(1), 1-9.
- Yaman, Ş., Irgin, P., & Kavasoğlu, M. (2013). Communication strategies: Implications for EFL University Students. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 3(2), 255-268.