

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FACE TO FACE INTERACTION IN TEACHING SPEAKING AT EDUCATION OF PADJADJARAN (EOP) ENGLISH COURSE PAREPARE

Husnah, Basri Jafar, Kisman Salija
Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

husnahhr3@gmail.com

basrijafar@gmail.com

kismansalija@gmail.com

Abstract: This research investigated the implementation of Face to Face Interaction in Education of Padjadjaran (EoP) Parepare. This research answered the questions: 1) how is Face to Face Interaction implemented in speaking; 2) how does the face to face interaction impact students' speaking performance; and 3) how do students response to face to face interaction in speaking EFL. The research proposed qualitative case study design. The results of the study showed that the trainers have two categories in implementing face to face interaction strategy in teaching speaking, the first trainer have highly Face to Face interaction in teaching speaking and the second trainer have mediumly face to face interaction in teaching speaking. The next result showed the impact of FTF Interaction in students' speaking performance which was have two impacts, they were linguistic impact included students' fluency, students' vocabulary, students' accuracy, and students' pronunciation and non-linguistic impact included students' eye contact, body language, and attention, self-confidence and motivation, empathy and feedback, students' volume in speaking, students' focus that stay on topic when they speak, and effective and efficient time limit. The last result was the students' response to FTF Interaction in speaking EFL. There were two kinds of responses that was found in the research, they were positive response and negative response

Keyword: *Face to Face Interaction, teaching and learning Speaking*

INTRODUCTION

Face to face interaction has been implemented in many aspect of science as the way to deliver material. Teaching speaking by using face to face interaction with another student able to make them express all of their idea in mind, because there are some interaction with interlocutors. Harmer (2007) emphasized that students learn better when they are engaged with what is happening. An expert says, through face to face interaction, additional information is available such as that

deduced through body language, gesture and tone, volume and modulation of voice. Face to Face Interaction is considered as a good strategy in the course institution to improve their speaking ability using English in every day. But this still needs to be observed whether this is true or not. This encourages the research to see the implementation of Face to Face Interaction within the course institution. This research was intended to investigate the Implementation of Face to face interaction in speaking English as foreign language. Many previous researches conducted in second

language learner where they are not studying English as their major, in the other side, this research offer something different. The researcher was going to conduct the research at the course program in senior high school level, where students enrol English department as their major study. It was claimed odd, students who enrol English department, but reluctant to express their thought and idea freely and loudly. Moreover, researcher would also explore the impact of face to face interaction toward students' speaking performance and how does the students respond toward face to face interaction in the classroom. Therefore, researcher conducted a study on: **The Implementation of Face to Face Interaction in Speaking at Education of Padjadjaran (EoP) English Course Parepare.**

FACE TO FACE INTERACTION

Face to face interaction becomes a strategy. According to Dohen et al., (2010) Face to face interaction has been implemented in language learning because face to face communication is interactive, partner involved in a spoke conversation indeed build a complex communicative act together which involves linguistic, emotional, expressive, and more generally cognitive and social dimensions (Dohen et al., 2010).

The concept of face was first introduced into academic discourse by Goffman (1955, 1967), who defined face as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact (cited from Bargiela-Chiappini & Haugh, 2009). Face to face interaction has been implemented in language learning because face to face communication is interactive, partner involved in a spoke conversation indeed build a complex communicative act together which involves linguistic, emotional, expressive, and more

generally cognitive and social dimensions (Dohen et al., 2010).

From several definitions above, it can be concluded that face to face interaction in communication becomes one of the alternatives to make students able to speak up in foreign language learning as an alternative at teaching knowledge, educating and developing students' abilities both academically and non-academically.

SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

Pedagogic competence is one type of competence that must be mastered by a teacher. In substance, pedagogic competence is a teacher's ability to hand let things that have a correlation with the world of education. Lesson planning for implementing teaching and learning processes, and assessing students' learning is a reference of the teacher's ability to be accommodated by pedagogical competence. These aspects of speaking performance included: Accuracy, Fluency, Pronunciation, and Vocabulary.

Regarding to some experts in language teaching and learning, there are various problems students encountered in speaking English. Sadtono (1997) stated that are two problems in language learning and this problem divided into linguistic and non-linguistic problem. The linguistic problems include difficulties faced by learner in learning a language related to the aspects of language. Linguistic problem has some categories, include; Pronunciation is one of the most important things that students have to master in order to communicate appropriately and fluently. According to Fangzi (1998, p.36) pronunciation is result in whether or not someone's message can be passed or not by other people. Second language learners therefore need knowledge of the language they wish to speak, an

understanding of the phonetic structure of the language at the level of individual word, and understanding of intonation (Fulcher, 2003).

Vocabulary is an important aspects in teaching and learning a language (Edward, and Vallette, 1997, p.149) “vocabulary is one of the important factors in all language teaching; students must continually learn words as they learn structure and as they practice sound system. Furthermore, Laufer (1997, p.54) rehearse that vocabulary learning is at the heat of language learning and language use. In fact; it is what makes the essence of a language. Without vocabularies, speakers cannot convey the meaning and communicate in the target language.

The next is grammar. According to Jeffrey & Stacy (2003, p.171) “language grammar is a set of rules that govern its structure, which determines how words are arranged in units forming meaningful language.” Similarly, Michael (2005) defines grammar as “the rules that explain how words are combined, arranged, or changed to show certain kinds of meaning.” Furthermore, according to Ur (1996), sometimes grammar is defined as “the way words are put together to make correct sentences.

In non linguistics problem, According to Ur (1996), there are four main problems faced by students in speaking, they are: Inhibition, Latha (2012) reported that inhibition is the most common problem faced by students in learning foreign language. They worried to make mistake in speaking the language because they are afraid the speaker will criticize of them. Thus, in this condition they have high of inhibition and it causes they keep silent. Therefore, Inhibition must be reduced by thinking that everyone has to make mistake and the mistake is an experience for going to be better.

The next is nothing to say. Even if they are not inhibited, many learners complain that they cannot think of anything to say, they have no motive to express themselves beyond the guilty feeling that they should be speaking. Low or uneven participation, only one participant can talk at the time if he or she is to be heard and in a large group this means that each one will have little talking only, this problem is compounded by the tendency of some learners to dominate, while others speak very little or not at all. The next is mother tongue use, in classes where all, or a number of the learners share the same mother tongue, they may tend to use it because it is easier and it feels unnatural to speak too another in foreign language. If they talk in small groups, it can be quite difficult to get some classes particularly the less disciplined or motivated ones to keep to the second language.

METHODOLOGY

This research designed opted the qualitative approach with case study to identifying the implementation of face to face interaction meeting in learning speaking English language as foreign language. The researcher also wanted to find out the using of face to face interaction in learning speaking and how do students response in speaking using face to face interaction strategy. As Yin (2003) cited in (Heigham & Croker, 2009) defining case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries and contexts are not clearly evident.

In this research, the researcher collected the data through observation and interview. Then, the data were analyzed and interpreted through interactive model of Miles and Huberman (2014). The researcher employed this method to collect and

analyzed data which were suitable with the purpose of this research in order to get the description data about the implementation of Face to Face interaction in speaking.

The participant of the research was the students and trainers of EoP Parepare in speaking English course. The researcher had chosen one class as a participant of the research. The goal of using purposive sampling was to get information from the participants. There were some reasons why does the researcher select that subject of research: The First, all of the students were tend to use English in the class not just in the classroom but around the course as well. The Second was students have different prior knowledge, some students have good performance in English and a half of them are really difficult to use English even in English area.

In this study, respondents were select by purposive sampling. On occasion, based on the previous knowledge of a population and the specific purpose of the research, the researcher uses a purposive sample. Johnson and Christensen (2012), purposive sampling procedure is a non random sampling technique in which the researcher socialist person with specific characteristics to participate in research study. In addition, Creswell (2012) assumed that in purposive sampling, researchers intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon. It means that purposive sampling is a technique of choosing sampling of source data with specific consideration.

Patton (2002) explains that observation is a method to describe the behavior of participants in a study from an open, inductive, and holistic perspective. Observation can be called as monitoring and systematic registry about phenomenon which is researched by direct observation and indirect observation (Hadi, 2004). In collecting

data, the researcher engaged in learning and teaching activity to observe the condition of class in use face to face interaction in English communication and students' activities in learning speaking English foreign language and investigate object of the research, and record many important cases which have relation with the research such as learning speaking with face to face interaction.

The researcher analyzed students' activity in speaking with their other friends with face to face interaction in communication and implements face to face strategy in the class also and observed the trainer in use the strategy in teaching process. Therefore, this technique was categorized as participant observation. The emphasis during observation is on understanding the natural environment as lived by participants, without altering or manipulating it. The researcher will apply nonparticipant observation. Gay *et.al* (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2012) assumes in nonparticipant observation, the observer is not directly involved in the situation being observed. In other words, the researcher observes but does not interact or participate in the life of the setting under study. The researcher will focus on gathering the data by record the teaching and learning process.

An interview is a purposeful interaction in which one person obtains information from another (Gay et al., 2012) Interviews permit researchers to obtain important data they cannot acquire from observation alone, although pairing observations and interviews provide a valuable way to gather complementary data.

This research applied a semi-structured interview. Gay *et.al*(Gay et al., 2012) stated that semi-structured interview was not to get answers to predetermined questions, but rather to find out where the participants will come from and what they had experienced while in

structured interviewed, the researcher has a specific set of questions that elicit specific information from respondents. It allowed the researcher to ask all of the information the same series of the questions. The result of the interview is used in analysing the data.

In analyzing data from classroom observation and interview, the researcher applied qualitative data analysis based on Miles and Huberman's theory (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2018) which consist of four stages: data collection, data display, data condensation, and conclusion-drawing/verifying.

1. *Data Collection*: The researcher had collected the data based on the research questions states in the previous chapter. The data was collected by using observation, interviews, and some document of trainers about students speaking ability. In collecting the data, the researcher had observed face to face interaction as a strategy in speaking EFL, the impact of face to face interaction of students' speaking learning process, and the trainer activities in teaching process to get data needed in this research. During the observation, the research took field note, photos, and video related to research questions. The researcher engaged in the classroom as participant observer and becomes a trainer using face to face interaction in learning speaking EFL but did not tell the participants that they were observed.
2. *Data Display*: After collecting the data through classroom observation, interview, video recording and field note, the researcher transcribed conversations and activities that the researcher had gotten in the field. The data transcribed into text by hand and displayed into Ms. Excel table to easier in coding the data.

3. *Data Condensation*: After transcribing the data into text, the researcher did coding (identify), labelling (select), and classifying the data based on the analyzing need in research problems. The data was classified based on the implementation of face to face interaction in the speaking at EFL classroom which was divided into three aspects: the using of face to face interaction in students' communication, the impact of face to face in learning and students' response in communication.
4. *Conclusion-drawing/verifying*: After displaying and coding the data, the last step was conclusion, after displaying and coding the data, the researcher verified the research by drawing and verifying the data (make conclusion).

RESULT

The data in this study were obtained by researchers from several observations and also interviews with students in English course at Education of Padjadjaran (EoP) Parepare. There are two trainers who have been interviewed to get in-depth information about the steps of the teacher in teaching speaking for the students with face to face interaction and there are twenty students who have been observed in the class. The interview was carried out on the date June, 17th 2019 and making observations on the same date. There are some important items in the steps to teach speaking for students which will be presented according to the data.

In implementing face to face interaction in speaking, there are 2 stages that have been done by the trainers. Those stages are (1) the learning planning stage and (2) learning implementation stage, there are four activities in learning implementation stages are: first activity, main activity, final activity, and closing/games. Every

trainer followed that stage in teaching speaking for students.

In the investigation of the following stages, the first trainer showed highly face to face interaction in teaching activity, she followed all stages in teaching speaking activity. In the learning planning stage, the trainer always improves speaking material for students by see students' interest and the newest viral topics. In the learning implementation stage, the first trainer did every activities and made class become fun by giving a games in speaking. While the second trainer showed mediumly face to face interaction in teaching speaking. The second trainers sometime did not improve the material just followed the guide book and did not always give a game in speaking activity. Students sometimes felt bored.

The next investigation is the impact of face to face interaction in the students' speaking performance. The results of this study are grouped into 2 impacts based on the theory used by the researcher regarding the use of face to face interaction in speaking who becomes one of the alternatives to make students able to speak up in foreign language they are linguistic impact and non-linguistic impact.

The investigation showed that in learning speaking with face to face interaction, students could be fix their fluency, vocabulary, accuracy, and pronunciation as a part of linguistic items. In non-linguistic items, face to face interaction can impact students way in speak up. It could be seen in the students' eye contact, body language, and attention; self confidence and motivation; students' empathy and feedback; students' volume in speaking; students' focus that stay on topic when they speak; and effective and efficient time limit. In the case of the impact of face to face interaction in students speaking performance, students just

found difficulties in speaking volume and their pronunciation in speaking. Some of them felt shy to speak up so sometime their volume voice are lower.

The next investigation is students' respond to face to face interaction in speaking EFL. The result of this study showed that there are 3 responses that arise in students speaking English based on the Jalaluddin rahmat theory in psychology of communication, are cognitive responses relating to thought or reasoning, affective responses relating to feelings (attitudes, emotions, and values), and behavioral responses refers to actions, activities, or behavioral habits. Related to students' responses to Face to Face Interaction strategies in their use in speaking, all three responses emerge in students.

Cognitive responses from students in the form of increased knowledge about English, especially speaking, both in terms of their vocabulary and knowledge of their tenses which began to be applied in speaking activities by speaking Face to Face to friends or trainers. Affective response given by students was the reduction in feelings of shame and fear of being wrong in students so that it could make students more confident in speaking even though they still have limited vocabulary. Behavioral responses that arose from students with Face to Face interaction in speaking activities were students more active in using English in class because of the habits they could use English and hear from their friends and trainers who used English every day. This made students able to play an active role in speaking activities. From the three forms of response that emerged, researchers found that there were two forms of responses given by students in face to face interaction in speaking, namely Positive Response and Negative Response. Students are more likely to

give a positive response than a negative response.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Teaching English speaking as foreign language for students is a challenge that is quite challenging for everyone. Make a good performance in deliver information to other person to make listener easy to understand what speaker says is really difficult for students as foreign language. Some approach should be found by the teacher to make students easy to express their idea spontaneously. Goffman (1982) said that the term face is defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face to face interaction becomes one of the alternatives to make students speak in English by direct contact.

Based on research conducted at Education of Padjadjaran (EoP) English course the following results are obtained: (1) the implementation of Face to Face Interaction in the class used two stages they are planning stage and implementation stage. In the planning stage the trainers made preparations for learning materials for students. In the implementation stage, there were four activities in teaching they are first

REFERENCE

- Acheampong, J. (n.d.). *Face to face learning and Distance learning*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/6873453/Face_to_face_learning_and_Distance_learning
- Ali, R. (n.d.). *The Impact of Face-to-Face ...* 10.
- Amro, H. J., Mundy, M.-A., & Kupczynski, L. (2015). *The effects of Age and Gender on student achievement in face-to-face and online college algebra classes*. 27, 22.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, F., & Haugh, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Face, communication and social interaction*. London; Oakville, CT: Equinox Pub.
- Boonsue, W., Jansem, A., & Srinaowaratt, S. (2015). Interactional Patterns in Face-to-face and Synchronous Computer-mediated Communication in Problem-based Learning Contexts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(1), 99. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0601.12>

activity, main activity, final activity, and closing/Games. All of that activities were done by the trainers to make students more actively in the speaking activity. Based on the data from the field it could be concluded that the first trainer has a highly face to face interaction while the second trainer has mediumly face to face interaction in teaching speaking. (2) there are two impacts of Face to Face Interaction in the students' speaking performance; they were linguistic impact and non-linguistic impact. The parts of linguistic impact were the students' fluency, students' vocabulary, students' accuracy, and students' pronunciation. Non-linguistic impact could be seen in the students' eye contact, body language, and attention, self confidence and motivation, empathy and feedback, students' volume, students' focus that stay on topic when they speak, and effective and efficient time limit. (3) There were three kinds of students' respond to Face to Face Interaction in speaking EFL; they are Cognitive responses, Affective responses, and Behavioral responses. Based on the responds from the students, it could be concluded that there were two kinds of responses that students had made, they were positive responses and negative responses.

- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H. D. (2002). *Strategies for success: A practical guide to learning English*. White Plains (N.Y.): Longman.
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on speaking*. Sydney: National Center for
- Chen, L. (n.d.). *The Effect of Empathy on College English Speaking*.
- Dohen, M., Schwartz, J.-L., & Bailly, G. (2010). Speech and face-to-face communication – An introduction. *Speech Communication*, 52(6), 477–480.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.specom.2010.02.016>
- Ellis, R., Ellis, P. R., & Ellis (taalkunde), R. R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1982). *Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face behavior* (1st Pantheon Books ed). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Harwood, J. (2010). The Contact Space: A Novel Framework for Intergroup Contact Research. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 29(2), 147–177.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X09359520>
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (Eds.). (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: a practical introduction*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire [England]; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Helminen, T. M. (n.d.). *The Effect of Eye Contact on Arousal and Attention*. 111.
- Kendon, A., Harris, R. M., & Key, M. R. (1975). *Organization of Behavior in Face-to-face Interaction*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Kirkman, B. L., Rosen, B., Tesluk, P. E., & Gibson, C. B. (2004). The Impact of Team Empowerment on Virtual Team Performance: The Moderating Role of Face-to-Face Interaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 175–192.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/20159571>
- Meyer, D. K. A. (2003). *FACE-TO-FACE VERSUS THREADED DISCUSSIONS: THE ROLE OF TIME AND HIGHER-ORDER THINKING*. 7(3), 11.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. NY:McGraw-Hill.
- Nunan, D. (2015). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: An introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Raidt, S., Bailly, G., & Elisei, F. (n.d.). *Analyzing and Modeling Gaze during Face-to-Face Interaction*. 7.
- Ramona Henter. (2013). Affective factors involved in learning a foreign language. *Science Direct*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.274>
- Reeve, J. (2009). *Understanding motivation and emotion* (5th ed). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: a description and analysis*. In *Cambridge Language Teaching Library*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

ARTICLE.docx

8 menit yang lalu



6%

Risiko dari plagiarisme:

HIGH

Parafrase

1%

Kutipan salah

0%

Concentration



Bagikan

Deep

\$ 1.00

Monetize

View report

\$ 6.75