

**THE EFFECT OF FACE TO FACE INTERACTION TECHNIQUE
TOWARD SPEAKING ABILITY OF THE FIRST YEAR
STUDENTS AT SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL AL-HUDA
PEKANBARU**



BY

RESTI KURNIASIH EKO RISTI

NIM. 10814003423

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2012 M**

**THE EFFECT OF FACE TO FACE INTERACTION TECHNIQUE
TOWARD SPEAKING ABILITY OF THE FIRST YEAR
STUDENTS AT SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL AL-HUDA
PEKANBARU**

Thesis

Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for Getting Bachelor Degree of Education
(S.Pd.)



By

**RESTI KURNIASIH EKO RISTI
NIM. 10814003423**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU
PEKANBARU
1433 H/2012 M**

ABSTRAK

Resti Kurniasih Eko Risti (2012) : “Pengaruh dari Face to Face Interaction Teknik terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Bahasa Inggris Siswa Kelas I SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru”

Penelitian ini dilakukan karena adanya masalah yang sedang dihadapi siswa dalam belajar bahasa Inggris khususnya masalah kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris seperti masih banyaknya siswa menggunakan bahasa ibunya ketika belajar bahasa Inggris, siswa takut salah berbicara bahasa Inggris, siswa lebih banyak diam ketika ditanya dalam bahasa Inggris, siswa jarang praktek berbicara bahasa Inggris dengan temanya, dan siswa kurang perhatian ketika belajar bahasa Inggris.

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris siswa Kelas I SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru sebelum dan setelah menggunakan Face to Face Interaction Teknik dan melihat apakah ada perbedaan pada kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris antara sebelum dan setelah menggunakan Face to Face Interaction Teknik.

Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian eksperimen dengan desain The One-Group Pretest and PostTest. Sample penelitian terdiri dari satu kelas yang berjumlah 30 orang siswa. Sebelum memulai penelitian siswa diberikan pre-test dan post-test diberikan setelah penelitian dilaksanakan. Data penelitian ini diperoleh dari nilai Pre-test dan post-test siswa dan dianalisa dengan menggunakan SPSS versi 16.

Setelah data dianalisa ditemukan bahwa kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris siswa setelah diajarkan menggunakan Face to Face Interaction Teknik lebih baik jika dibandingkan dengan sebelumnya. Jadi adanya perbedaan yang signifikan terhadap kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris Siswa antara sebelum dan setelah menggunakan Face to Face Interaction Teknik .

Dari hasil Penelitian tersebut, bisa disimpulkan bahwa pengajaran dengan menggunakan Face to Face Interaction Teknik memberikan perkembangan yang lebih baik terhadap kemampuan berbahasa Inggris Siswa Kelas I SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru.

ABSTRACT

Resti Kurniasih Eko Risti (2012) : "The Effect of Face to Face Interaction Technique toward Speaking Ability of the First Year Students at Senior High School Al-Huda Pekanbaru"

This research was carried out because of the students' speaking problems which were using mother tongues in speaking, afraid of making mistakes in speaking, kept silent or shake their heads as they were asked questions, lack of speaking practice with their friends, lack of attention when the teacher explained the English lesson during teaching and learning process.

This research aimed at finding out the students' speaking ability before and after being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique first year of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru and whether there is significant different on the students' ability in speaking before and after using Face to Face Interaction technique.

This research was an experimental study which was the One-Group Pretest-Posttest Design. The researcher took one class as the sample of the research consisting of thirty students. The students were given pre-test before giving treatment by using Face to Face Interaction Technique and post-test were given after the treatment. The data of the research were obtained from the scores of Pre-test and Post-test which were analyzed by using SPSS 16 Version.

After having calculated the scores, it was found that the students' speaking ability after giving treatment were better than before treatment. It means that there is significant difference between the students taught by using Face to Face interaction and without it.

From the research finding, it can be concluded that teaching English by using Face to Face Interaction technique provides remarkable progress of students' speaking ability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

The greatest gratitude is due to Allah SWT, the Lord of the Universe, for it is by the grace of Him that the writer can accomplish this academic requirement for the award of bachelor degree at the Department of English Education, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University (UIN) of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau. Peace and salutation be upon him, the great prophet, Muhammad SAW since he has taught and lead us to straight way.

In conducting and completing the research the writer owes a debt of gratitude to many people who have generously supplemented morally on essence of this project paper. Therefore, she would like to express great thanks and appreciation to:

1. Prof. Dr. H.M. Nazir, the Rector of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
2. Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M.Ag, the Dean of Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.
3. Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M.Pd, the Chairperson of Department of English Education.
4. Dedy Wahyudi, M.Pd, the Secretary of English Education Department
5. Yasir Amri, M.Pd, the writer's supervisor for valuable helps and suggestions in completing this project paper.
6. All lecturers of Department of English Education for their knowledge.

7. Hj. Ratmiwati, the Headmasters of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru for her cooperation during collecting the data of the research
8. Sumita, A.Md and Bisri, S.Pd. the English teachers of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru for their good cooperation in gathering the data of their research.
9. Nazarudin and Warni, her beloved parents for their support and praying during her study.
10. H. Masril and Hj. Azmi, her beloved parents in law for their support and praying during her study.
11. Dedy Wahyudi, M.Pd. her beloved husband for valuable helps, supports and praying during her study.
12. Syawal Ade Saputra, her beloved brother, and all her beloved brothers and sisters in law for their all supports.
13. All her classmates that cannot be mentioned their named one by one for their encouragement and motivation.

Finally, the writer really admits that this project paper is still far from perfectness or it has many weaknesses. Therefore, constructive critiques and suggestions are highly appreciated. May Allah blesses us always. Amin.

Pekanbaru, June 20, 2012

The Researcher,

Resti Kurniasih Eko Risti
NIM. 10814003423

THE LIST OF CONTENTS

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL.....	i
EXAMINER APPROVAL.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	vi
THE LIST OF CONTENTS.....	ix
THE LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
THE LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xiii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	
A. The Background.....	1
B. The Definition of the Term.....	5
C. The Problem	
1. The Identification of the Problem.....	5
2. The Limitation of the Problem.....	6
3. The Formulation of the Problem.....	6
D. The Objective and Significance of the Research	
1. The Objective of the Research.....	7
2. The Significance of the Research.....	7
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
A. The Theoretical Framework	
1. The Concept of Speaking.....	8
2. The Components of Speaking.....	9
3. The Purpose of Speaking.....	12
4. The Problems in Speaking.....	13
5. The Concepts of Face to Face Interaction Technique.....	15
6. The Advantages of Using Face to Face	

Interaction Technique.....	17
7. Teaching Speaking by Using Face to Face	
Interaction Technique.....	18
B. The Relevant Research.....	18
C. The Operational Concept.....	19
D. The Assumption and Hypothesis	
1. Assumption.....	20
2. Hypothesis.....	21

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD

A. The Research Design.....	22
B. The Location and Time of the Research.....	24
C. The Subject and Object of the Research.....	24
D. The Population and Sample of the Research.....	24
E. The Data Collection Technique.....	24
F. Technique of Analyzing Data.....	27
G. Reliability and Validity of the Test.....	28

CHAPTER IV THE PRESENTATION OF THE DATA ANALYSIS

A. The Description of Research Procedure.....	30
B. The Data Presentation.....	30
C. The Data Analysis	
1. Data Analysis of Students' Pre-test Scores.....	36
2. Data Analysis of Students' Post-test Scores.....	37
3. The Difference between the Students' Speaking Ability before and after being Taught by Using Face to Face Interaction Technique (Pre-test and Post-test Scores).....	38

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion.....	41
B. Suggestion.....	42

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Table III. 1	The Activities of Teaching by Using Face to Face Interaction Technique	25
Table III. 2	Speaking Assessment.....	26
Table III.3	Paired Sample Correlation.....	29
Table IV.1	Pre-test Score of Two Raters.....	32
Table IV.2	The Distribution of Frequency of Students' Pre-test Scores.....	33
Table IV.3	Post-test Score of Two Raters.....	34
Table IV.4	The Distribution of Frequency of Students' Post-test Scores....	35
Table IV.5	Students' Pre-test Scores.....	36
Table IV.6	Students' Post Test Score.....	37
Table IV.7	The Difference of Mean of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test Scores.....	38
Table IV.8	Mean, Standard Deviation, and Standard Error Mean.....	39
Table IV.9	Paired Samples Test.....	40

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. The Background

One of the most fascinating aspects of human being is the ability to learn language. In learning language, it has been known that language is a medium used for interaction utilized to convey and express messages or information. People can use some ways in their speaking, such as interaction or dialogue to deliver their language to interlocutors. It is a fact that indicates how important language is. Moreover, learning a foreign language gives a particular impression for those who learn it and it will encourage the interest of learners to learn it.

The difficulties experienced by the students in expressing their feelings and ideas in speaking have strongly been consideration for the students and the teachers to find and know the factor influence the students' ability in interaction. It means, the teachers know the technique to teaching speaking. The students will be brought and guided to have encouraged more their interest in interaction.

Talking about interaction as a communication, we cannot separate it with the language. Language is a tool to express the ideas, and to convey our purpose to another people. In other words, language is a means of communication used by human to express ideas, thoughts, feelings, and opinions.

The ability of interacting in English is one of the primary objectives of teaching English at Senior High School in accordance with KTSP (Educational Unit Level Curriculum), in which the student are expected to be able to respond the meaning in transactional and interpersonal conversation either formal and informal context accurately and fluently. On the other hands, to reach the goal of the curriculum demanded, the students are to have ability in English interaction both formal and informal situation.

In order to achieve the aim of teaching English, English teaching at Senior High School of Al-Huda Pekanbaru has been administered twice a week that consists of two hours for each meeting. Since the communication ability becomes the emphasis of curriculum, in the school, the students has also learned speaking. However, the second year students' speaking ability has not been satisfied yet, it is proven with the result of preliminary research having been done by the writer. It was done on February 2011. Based on the observation and interview conducted to the students and the teacher, teaching English especially speaking is done by the teacher through practicing the dialogue. The students are given the topic of speaking. They are divided into some groups, which the number of students in each group is based on the roles of the dialogued. They are then asked to memorize the dialogue. Afterward, they perform it in front of the class. It is found that there are many students having problems in speaking English. The problems can be seen as in following phenomena:

1. Many of the students use mother tongues in speaking.
2. Many of the students are afraid of making mistakes in speaking.
3. Many of the students always keep silent or shake their heads as they are asked questions.
4. Many of the students do not practice speaking with their friends.
5. Some of the students do not pay attention when the teacher explains the English lesson during teaching and learning process.

It is probably caused by the techniques, strategies or methods employed by the English teacher which are not appropriate with the students' condition. In other words, the techniques, strategies or methods used cannot lead the students to be able to speak English communicatively. It is due to the inappropriate speaking activities, which the students are normally learned speaking by memorizing and practicing the dialogue given. That is why the students' ability in speaking English is relatively low.

From the problems above, the English teacher is encouraged to implement a teaching technique for the sake of the students' success in learning English particularly speaking. One of the techniques as possible solution that can be used is Face to Face Interaction. As Brown in Reza stated that Interaction is the heart of communicative competence, when a learner interacts with another learner he/she receives input and produces output.¹ The interaction done benefits each learner in which they exchange information. It

¹ Reza Kalantari, *Techniques for Classroom Interaction* (International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS), Vol 3(4), 2009). p. 425.

is supported by Begley that Face to Face Interaction is exchanging of information, thought and feelings.²

Actually the human beings are social creatures, created by God Almighty, it has function to interact, to help and to share information each other. According to statements above, it is clear that Face to Face Interaction is one of the right techniques to develop students' speaking ability. The students will express their ideas, feeling and information with a fellow student in interaction each other. On the other hand, this teaching technique can help students to increase their speaking ability.

There are some aspects in interaction such as pronunciation, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. In Face to Face Interaction students should be able to convey their speech with good pronunciation, grammar, and fluently so that the students can comprehend each other, not only the speaker but also the interlocutor. Based on the symptoms above, the writer is interested in conducting a research entitled "The effect of Face to Face Interaction technique toward students' speaking ability of first year students at Senior High School Al Huda Pekanbaru".

² Kathleen A. Begley, *Face to Face Communication* (Boston:Thomson Netg, 2004). p.6.

B. Definition of the terms

To simplify the process of designing and application of the research and to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation, it is necessary to define the operational definition of the terms in this research.

1. Face to Face Interaction means one of the techniques that can be used in speaking interaction.³ In this study, Face to Face Interaction is a technique that is experimented to teach the first year students of senior high school Al-Huda, the interaction that is done by students to others to express their ideas, feeling and information in the classroom.
2. Speaking Ability means the active use of language to express meanings so that other people can make sense of them.⁴ In this research, speaking ability is the students' ability in speaking.

C. The problem

1. The Identification of the Problems

Based on the background and the phenomenon above, there are some problems that can be identified by the researcher as in the following:

- a. Why do the students still use mother tongues in speaking?
- b. Why are the students afraid to make mistakes in speaking?
- c. Why do the students always keep silent or shake their heads as they are asked questions?

³ R. A. Hudson, *Sociolinguistic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981). p. 106

⁴ Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (London and New York: Longman, 1985). p.16

- d. Why do the students not practice speaking with their friends?
- e. Why do the students not pay attention when the teacher explains the English lesson during teaching and learning process?

2. The Limitation of the Problem

Based on the identification of the problem above, it is clear that there are many problems involved. But, the writer wants to limit the problems discussed in this study. Since the techniques that have been used do not result in students' better progress of speaking English, this research focuses on the effect of the technique used on the students' speaking ability, which is Face to Face Interaction technique.

3. The Formulation of the Problem

Because those problems are too broad to be researched, the writer is decided to limit on the problems discussed in this research as follows:

- a. How is the students' ability before being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique at first year of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru?
- b. How is the students' ability after being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique at first year of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru?
- c. Is there any significant difference on the students' ability in speaking before and after using Face to Face Interaction technique at first year of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru?

D. The Objectives and the Significance of the Research

1. The Objectives of the Research

Based on the formulation of the problem above, the objectives of the study in this research are:

- a. To find out the students' speaking ability before being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique at first year of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru.
- b. To find out the students' speaking ability after being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique at first year of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru.
- c. To find out whether there is a significant difference on the students' ability in speaking before and after using Face to Face Interaction technique at first year of SMA Al-Huda Pekanbaru

2. Significance of the Research

- a. To contribute the students in order to be aware of speaking English.
- b. To give the information to the English teachers about the technique in teaching speaking.
- c. To enlarge and develop the writer insight and knowledge.
- d. To fulfill one of the requirements for undergraduate degree at education and teacher training faculty of state Islamic University of SUSKA Riau.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Theoretical Frame Work

1. The Concept of Speaking

Speaking is a language skill or as a mean of communication in which one can express his ideas or information to others in spoken form. It is a complex language skill, because someone needs to find ideas or information then it is arranged in a good order. Some definitions of speaking are stated by some experts.

First, speaking is a skill involving some kinds of production on the part of language user.¹ It means that it is an ability of producing a language orally. Second, speaking is a complex set of abilities that involves many components; including pronunciation, listening, and grammar skills.² By mastering the components involved in speaking, speakers can produce a good spoken language.

Moreover, speaking is the active use of language to express meanings so that other people can make sense of them.³ Similarly, it is

¹ Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (London and New York: Longman, 1985) p.16

² Michael H. Long, Jack, C. Richards, *Methodology in TESOL* (Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1987) p.189

³ Lynne Cameron, *Teaching Languages to Young Learners* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) p.40

active, productive, and makes use of the aural medium.⁴ In speaking activities, the speaker and interlocutor have to understand with each other.

From definition above, it can be concluded that speaking is language skill or a mean of communication in which one can express his ideas or information in a good logical order and master the convention mechanics of speaking (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension).

2. The Components of Speaking

There are some components that influence the students' speaking ability, which the more they can master the components, the better they speak. Weir states that there are two components of speaking, accuracy and fluency.⁵ Similarly, Ur emphasizes on the two aspects or components in the scales of oral testing criteria: fluency and accuracy.⁶ Each of these aspects can be assessed as follows:

a. Accuracy

- 1) Little or no language produced
- 2) Poor vocabulary, mistakes in basic grammar, may have very strong foreign accent
- 3) Adequate but not rich of vocabulary, makes obvious grammar mistakes, slight foreign accent
- 4) Good range of vocabulary, occasionally grammar slips, slight foreign accent

⁴ H.G. Widdowson, *Teaching Language as Communication* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979) p.58

⁵ C.J. Weir, *Understanding and Developing Language Test* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1993) p.30

⁶ Penny Ur, *A Course in Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) p.135

- 5) Wide vocabulary appropriately used, virtually no grammar mistakes, native-like or slight foreign accent

b. Fluency

- 1) Little or no communication
- 2) Very hesitant and brief utterance, sometimes difficult to understand
- 3) Get ideas across, but hesitantly and briefly
- 4) Effective communication in short turns
- 5) Easy and effective communication, uses long turns

It is also supported by O'Malley that the concept seems very suitable designed for authentic oral assessment of English language learner that consists of utterance, fluency, structure, vocabulary and understanding of listening.⁷

Furthermore, there are some proficiency descriptions of speaking, which speaking skills assessed based on the components of speaking as Hughes as in the following⁸:

a. Accent

- 1) Pronunciation frequently unintelligible.
- 2) Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition.
- 3) "Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.
- 4) Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding?
- 5) No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.
- 6) Native pronunciation, with to trace of "foreign accents".

⁷ O'Malley, J.M, L.Valdez Pierce, *Authentic Assessment for Language Learners* (New York: Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 1996) p. 68

⁸ Arthur Hughes, *Testing for language teachers*, Second edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) p.131

b. Grammar

- 1) Grammar almost entirely inaccurate except in stock phrases.
- 2) Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication.
- 3) Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.
- 4) Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding.
- 5) Few errors, with no patterns of failure.
- 6) No more than two errors during the interview.

c. Vocabulary

- 1) Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation.
- 2) Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc).
- 3) Choice of words sometimes inaccurate, limitation of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics.
- 4) Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interests; general vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical subject with some circumlocutions.
- 5) Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.
- 6) Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker.

d. Fluency

- 1) Speech is too halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible.
- 2) Speech is very slow and uneven except for short or routine sentences.
- 3) Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted.
- 4) Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping for words.
- 5) Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptively non-native in speed and evenness.
- 6) Speech on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker's.

e. Comprehension

- 1) Understand too little for the simplest type of conversation.
- 2) Understand only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topics; requires constant repetition and rephrasing.
- 3) Understand careful, somewhat simplified speech when engaged in a dialogue, but may require considerable repetition and rephrasing.
- 4) Understand quite normal educated speech when engaged in a dialogue, but requires occasional repetition and rephrasing.
- 5) Understand everything in normal educated conversation except for very colloquial or low-frequency items, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.
- 6) Understand everything on both formal and colloquial speech to be expected of and educated native speaker.

Pertaining to the theory of speaking skill aspects above, it can be concluded that there are five aspect assessed in speaking skill, accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Those will determine the students' speaking ability. The better the students master the aspects, the better their speaking skill is.

3. The Purpose of Speaking

In this study, the writer applies the purposes of speaking as expected in 1994 curriculum are as follows:

1. To conduct conversation about text and picture.
2. To be able describe thing, people, place and sequence of events orally.
3. To express ideas, opinions and feelings simply.
4. To tell about planning simply.

These purposes indicate that teaching English in Indonesia is to make students to be able to use English for any topics and expressions.

According to CEF (Council of Europe) in Luoma, there are six categories of communication function.⁹ They are:

- a. Giving and asking for factual information, e.g. describing, reporting, asking;
- b. Expressing and asking about attitudes, e.g. agreement/ disagreement, knowledge/ ignorance, ability, permission;
- c. Suasion, e.g. suggesting, requesting, warning;
- d. Socialising, e.g. attracting attention, addressing, greeting, introducing;
- e. Structuring discourse, e.g. opening, summarizing, changing the theme, closing;
- f. Communication repair, e.g. signaling non understanding, appealing for assistance, paraphrasing.

Since speaking has a lot of functions or purposes, the main objective of speaking is to communicate.

4. The Problems in Speaking

Speaking to others is done in order to exchange information. Listeners and speakers are expected to be able to understand each other. But, normal speech contains a fair number of slips and errors such as mispronounced words, mixed sounds, and wrong words due to

⁹ Sari Luoma, *Assessing Speaking*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) p.

inattention.¹⁰ Nunan states that one of the complications in determining the difficulty of speaking tasks is the so-called interlocutor effect.¹¹

In addition, Ur discussed that there are problems of speaking activity experienced by students, they are:

a. Inhibition.

Learners are often inhibited about making mistakes, fearful of criticism or losing face, or simply shy of the attention that their speech attracts.

b. Nothing to say.

They have no motive to express themselves beyond the guilty feeling that they should be speaking.

c. Low or uneven participant.

This problem is compounded by the tendency of some learners to dominate, while others speak very little or not at all.

d. Mother- tongue use.

They may tend to use it: because it is easier, because it feels unnatural to speak to one another in a foreign language and because they feel less exposed if they are speaking their mother tongue.¹²

The problems above may be caused by some factors Ur:

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 19

¹¹ David Nunan, *Language Teaching Methodology* (London: Pearson Education Ltd, 2000) p.47

¹² Penny Ur, *Op.cit.* p.121

- a. The teacher seems dislike hearing the incorrect grammar in the classroom.
- b. The language educators have stressed linguistics competence more than communicative competence.
- c. Audio-lingual theorists have been felt that the students should not be permitted to create language in uncontrolled situations.

The students in learning English must recognize problems and their causes in speaking. By doing so, the students are expected to avoid the problems of speaking in order to be able to speak fluently and correctly.

5. The Concept of Face to Face Interaction Technique

Face to Face Interaction technique is a teaching technique in giving opportunities for interaction each other in the foreign language classroom.¹³ Subsequently, it is communication between people in which the participants are physically present.¹⁴ Then, Face to Face Interaction is part of social interaction in which one person talks to another.¹⁵ It is clear that Face to Face Interaction is a teaching technique that can be done by the teacher to teach speaking in which the students have interaction in pair; they can share their feelings, ideas, information, etc.

¹³ Littlewood William, *Communicative Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) P. 62

¹⁴ Jack C. Richards. John Platt. Heidi Platt, *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (Edinburgh:Longman Group, 1999) p.135

¹⁵ R. A. Hudson, *Sociolinguistic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) p.

Face to Face Interaction is the process in which present individuals influence each other's actions.¹⁶ On the other hand, the student will be influenced by others to speech, step by step, they will make communication forwardz. It means they have been made interaction in speaking. The students can comprehend or understand each other; they can give new information's, message and ideas or vise versa in interaction, the students speaking ability will be improve because this case.

As Begley said that "Face to Face Interaction aims at understanding the functions in social interaction and even developing a control model for our talking heads while investigate the influence of state and social role. The students not only can know or comprehend something in interaction, but also they can practice their body language in interaction each other. Furthermore, Face to Face Interaction means the exchanging of information, thoughts, and feelings when the participants are in the same physical space."¹⁷

Based on the explanations above, it is clear that using Face to Face Interaction technique will help the students to improve their speaking ability, the teacher can choose one topic that should be discussed by the students, then, the student's speech in the same physical space directly. It is appropriate, the teacher can control classroom well, and it can help students

¹⁶ www. Encyclopedia.com. 2010.

¹⁷ Kathleen A. Begley, *Loc.cit*

to improve their speaking ability. They can speak to share ideas, messages and also information's directly.

6. The Advantages of Using Face to Face Interaction Technique

Face to Face Interaction technique will effect on the better progress of the speakers' speaking ability. To begin with, an act of communication through speaking is commonly performed in Face to Face Interaction and occurs as part of a dialogue or other form of verbal exchange.¹⁸ The speakers are able to understand the message spoken by the interlocutor when having interaction with each other because. Communicative or conversational skills involve Face to Face Interaction where meaning can be negotiated and is supported by contextual cues, such as the situation itself, gestures, facial expressions, and intonation¹⁹. In communication between two or more persons, the participants attempt to communicate a positive image of themselves which reflects the values and beliefs of the participants.²⁰

In addition, it immediately increases the amount of students practice, allow the students to use language, encourages the students co-operation which is itself important for the atmosphere of the class and for

¹⁸ H.G. Widdowson, *Loc.cit*

¹⁹ O'Malley, J.M, L.Valdez Pierce, *Op. Cit.* p. 60

²⁰ Jack C. Richards. John Platt. Heidi Platt, *Loc.cit*

the motivation it gives to learning with others or the students can help each other to use and learn language.²¹

It can be concluded that Face to Face Interaction leads the speaker not only to understand the message spoken by the speaker or called verbal communication but also to understand non verbal communication such as gesture, eyes contact, facial expression, etc.

7. Teaching Speaking by Using Face to Face Interaction Technique

Speaking skill requires the appropriate activities done by the learners because the activities will effect on the learners' progress in studying speaking. Therefore, Face to Face Interaction technique gives the students opportunity to practice English freely. The activities of teaching speaking by using Face to face technique can be seen as in the following:

- a. The teacher provides one topic to be talked.
- b. The teacher arranges the students into groups (two or more persons) to makes interaction.
- c. The students are sharing information about the topic by Face to Face Interaction.
- d. The students contribute the discussion as a listener and as a speaker in interaction.
- e. The teacher evaluates the students' speaking ability consisting of accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

²¹ Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (London and New York: Longman, 1985) p. 206

B. The Relevant Research

Sukmawati (2010) researched about the effect of using small-group discussion in improving the second year students' speaking skill of Islamic boarding school Daarun Nahdah Thawalib Bangkinang. The result showed that each of the strategy of small group discussion has significant positive effect on second year students' speaking skill of Islamic boarding school Daarun Nahdah Thawalib Bangkinang. It means that working in small group and pairs become skilled at co-operating with others and express their own opinions, ideas and felling guided by the teacher.²²

Based on the explanation above, it is similar to the explanation of face to face interaction technique, which she found that small group discussion is able to improve the second year students' speaking skill.

Ghina (1999) researched about the students' ability in Oral Communication at the Second Year of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru". Based on her research, speaking is a communication which makes clear and convincing oral presentations to individuals or groups. The conclusion from this writer is that the students need the importance supporting guidance, to improve the students' speaking ability.²³

Dedy Chandra (2008) conducted a research about the effectiveness of using small-group discussion strategy in improving students Speaking of

²² Sukmawati Sukmawati. "The Effect of Using Small-group Discussion in Improving the Second Year Students' Speaking Skill of Islamic Boarding School Daarun Nahdah Thawalib Bangkinang. 2010" (Unpublished).

²³ Ghina. "The Students' Ability in Oral Communication at the Second Year of Darul Hikmah Islamic Boarding School Pekanbaru. 1999". (Unpublished)

SMA N 5 Pekanbaru. He found that small-group discussion is able to improve the second year students' ability in performing drama script more confidently.²⁴

Based on the research conducted previously, this research is different from the previous researches. The researcher used interaction through the implementation of face to face interaction.

C. The Operational Concept

The theoretical concepts states above are still in general and in abstract form. Therefore, there are required to be operationally described by a particular word that is easy to measure empirically. The operational concept is the concept used to give explanation about theoretical framework in order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation to word the use Face to Face Interaction technique toward students' ability in speaking English. In this research, the writer concludes several indicators to be operated in the operational concept.

1. The Face to Face Interaction technique is classified as good if applied with the indicators as follows:
 - a. The teacher provides one topic.
 - b. The teacher arranges the students into groups (two or more person) to makes interaction.

²⁴ Dedy Chandra. "The Effectiveness of Using Small-group Discussion Strategy in Improving Students' Speaking of SMA N 5 Pekanbaru. 2008". (Unpublished)

- c. The students are sharing information about the topic by Face to Face Interaction.
 - d. The students contribute the discussion as a listener and as a speaker in interaction.
 - e. The teacher evaluates the students' speaking ability that consists of accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.
2. Students' ability in speaking English is classified as good if applied with the indicators as follows:
- a. The students are able to express their ideas in speaking orally.
 - b. The students practice their speaking without feeling anxiety/nervous.
 - c. The students are active in speaking interaction.
 - d. The students are able to speak English by using their own words.
 - e. The students are capable to place his/her tongue and lips in certain position to produce good sounds in speaking.
 - f. The students are able to speak English, with correct grammar, accent, fluency, appropriate vocabularies, and they can comprehend speaking easily.

D. The Assumption and Hypothesis

1. Assumptions

There are some assumptions of writer before coming to the research finding as in the following:

1. Some of the students' speaking ability is low and the others are high

2. There are many appropriate techniques for teaching speaking that can influence students' speaking ability, one of which is Face to Face Interaction. Using Face to Face Interaction Technique can help the students improve their speaking ability.

2. Hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant difference of using Face to Face Interaction technique on the first year students' speaking skill at Senior High School Al-Huda Pekanbaru.

Ha: There is a significant difference of using Face to Face Interaction technique on the first year students' speaking skill at Senior High School Al-Huda Pekanbaru.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

A. The Research Design

This research is an experimental study which is the One-Group Pretest-Posttest Design. The design involves a single group that is pretested (O), exposed to a treatment (X), and posttested (O).¹ Pretest provides a measure on some attribute or characteristic that you assess for participants in an experiment before they receive a treatment. A posttest is a measure on some attribute or characteristic that is assessed for participants in an experiment after a treatment.²

From the explanation above, the research design was a single group which is the one-group pretest-posttest design due to the condition of the school and limitation of time. Therefore, the writer took one class, which the class was given pretest first, a treatment was done afterward by teaching Face to Face Interaction technique, and post test was done after the treatment. In this project paper, writer researched the first year students of senior high school Al-Huda Pekanbaru by teaching the Face to Face Interaction technique in order to know whether the technique of Face to Face Interaction gives significant difference on the students' speaking ability or not.

¹ L.R. Gay, Peter Airasian, *Educational Research*, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2000) p.389

² John W. Cress Well, *Educational Research* (New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008) p.301

B. The Location and Time of the Research

The location of this research is at senior high school Al-Huda Pekanbaru. This research was conducted in 2012.

C. The Subject and object of the Research

The subject of this research was the first year students of senior high school Al-Huda Pekanbaru. The object of the research was the effect of Face to Face Interaction technique on students' speaking ability at the first year students of senior high school Al-Huda Pekanbaru.

D. The Population and Sample of the Research

The population of this research includes all the first year students of SMA Al-Huda. There were four classes all together, each class consisted of 30 students in average, so the total number of students was 120 persons. Since the design of the research refers to a single group, the writer took one class only as sample of the research. The writer took the samples by cluster random sampling. The population of the research can be seen as follows:

Table III.1
Distribution of the Research population and Sample

No	Class	Total students
1	X.1	30
2	X.2 (Experimental study)	30
3	X.3	30
4	X.4	30
Total		120

E. The Data Collection Technique

In order to get the data that are required in this research, the writer employed the procedures that can be seen in the following:

a. Pretest

The pretest was carried out in order to know the ability of the students before giving treatment in which the students were given a topic and then asked to do oral presentation.

b. Treatment

It was conducted after pretest. The writer taught the students by using Face to Face Interaction technique. It was done for six meetings. The Activities done for each meeting as in the following:

Table III.2
The Activities of Teaching by Using Face to Face Interaction Technique

No	Unit	Activity	Page
1	Unit 4 Telling Stories	Creating Story	98
2	Unit 4 Telling Stories	Identifying Characters in a Story	100
3	Unit 5 What Does It Look Like	Describing your Favorite Pet	113
4	Unit 5 What Does It Look Like	Identifying parts of Human Body	121
5	Unit 6 What a Beautiful Place	Finding out description of a school	138
6	Unit 6 What a Beautiful Place	Talking a description of a certain place	158

c. Posttest

The posttest was carried out in order to know the ability of the students after giving treatment in which the students were given a topic and then asked to do oral presentation.

Moreover, both pretest and posttest were done by recording the students' oral presentation. The recordings were given to two raters to assess students' speaking. The recordings were also written in the form of script for each student.

To assess the students' speaking, the writer used oral language scoring rubric based on the criteria of speaking, accent, grammar, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension as follows:

Table III.3
Speaking Assessment

Speaking Aspects	Scoring
Accent	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pronunciation frequently unintelligible. 2. Frequent gross errors and very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition. 3. "Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening, and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary. 4. Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding. 5. No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker. 6. Native pronunciation, with no trace of "foreign accent."
Grammar	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammar almost entirely inaccurate except in stock phrases. 2. Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication. 3. Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding. 4. Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding. 5. Few errors, with no patterns of failure. 6. No more than two errors during the interview.
Vocabulary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation. 2. Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas (time, food, transportation, family, etc.). 3. Choice of words sometimes inaccurate, limitations of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics. 4. Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interests; general vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical subject with some circumlocutions. 5. Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations. 6. Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an educated native speaker.
Fluency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible. 2. Speech is very slow and uneven except for short or routine sentences. 3. Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted. 4. Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness

	<p>caused by rephrasing and groping for words.</p> <p>5. Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptively non-native in speed and evenness.</p> <p>6. Speech on all professional and general topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker's.</p>
Comprehension	<p>1. Understands too little for the simplest type of conversation.</p> <p>2. Understands only slow, very simple speech on common social and touristic topics; requires constants repetition and rephrasing.</p> <p>3. Understands careful, somewhat simplified speech when engaged in a dialogue, but may require considerable repetition and rephrasing.</p> <p>4. Understands quite well normal educated speech when engaged in a dialogue, but requires occasional repetition or rephrasing.</p> <p>5. Understands everything in normal educated conversation except for very colloquial or low-frequency items, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.</p> <p>6. Understands everything in both formal and colloquial speech to be expected of an educated native speaker.</p>

Adopted from Hughes³

F. Technique of Analyzing Data

The score was analyzed by using statistical formula, which statistic analysis and different mean were analyzed by using Paired Sample test.⁴ It was analyzed by using SPSS.⁵

G. Reliability and Validity of the Test

Reliability has to do with accuracy of measurement. This kind of accuracy is reflected in obtaining of similar results when measurement is repeated on different occasions or with different instruments by different persons. The characteristic is termed consistency.

³ Arthur Hughes, *Loc. Cit.*

⁴ Hartono. *Statistik Pendidikan*, Pustaka Pelajar dan Zanafa, Yogyakarta, 2005.

⁵ Hartono. *SPSS 16.0. Analisis Data Statistik dan Penelitian*. (Pekanbaru: Pustaka Pelajar, 2008) p.159

Validity in general refers to appropriateness of a given test on any of its component parts as measure of what it is purposed to measure. It means the test will be valid to the extent that is measured what it is supposed to measure.

Validity and reliability of test items is related in terms that a test is possible to be reliable without being valid for specified purpose, but it is impossible a test to be valid without being reliable. To reliability of the test, the product moment formula was used. It was analyzed by using SPSS 16 version.

Then, the r product moment can be obtained by considering the degree of freedom (df) as follows:

$$df = N - nr$$

N = number of cases

Nr = the total variable correlated

Statistically the hypotheses are:

$$H_0 : r < r$$

$$H_0 : r \geq r$$

H_0 is accepted if $r < r$ or there is no significant correlation between pre-test and post-test. H_0 is accepted if $r \geq r$ or there is significant correlation between pre-test and post-test.

The following table describes the correlation between score of pre-test and post-test.

Table III.4
Paired Sample Correlation

Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 postexp & preexp	30	.171	.366

From the table above, it can be seen that the coefficient of correlation product moment (r) between post-test and pre-test is 0.366. before comparing it to r table (r_{α}), we have to obtain the degree of freedom (df).

df is 29. Then r_{α} is compared to r_{α} at level of 5%. At level of 5% is 0.355. It can be read $0.355 < 0.366$. It means H^a is accepted and H_0 is rejected.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRESENTATION OF THE DATA ANALISYS

A. The Description of Research Procedure

The purpose of this research is to know the students' speaking ability before and after being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique and to know whether or not there is a significant difference of the students' speaking ability between before and after using Face to Face Interaction technique. The data of the research were obtained from the scores of the students' pre-test and post-test. Before the treatment was done, the researcher gave pre-test to the students X2. While post-test was done after the treatment. The test was given in the form of oral presentation. It was evaluated based on the five components of speaking: accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Each component has score category.

B. The Data Presentation

As mentioned earlier, the data of this research were gotten from pre-test and post-test. The students were given pre-test. They were asked to do an oral presentation before being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique.

After having taught for six meetings, the students were given post-test. They were asked to do an oral presentation about "What a beautiful place!". The topic given was adopted from Students' Handbook (Look Ahead) page 137 published by Erlangga

The students' speaking was recorded by the researcher and was backed up into CD. Then, it was collected to evaluate the students' speaking ability in terms of accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. The researcher used two raters to score the students' speaking ability. The students' scores of pre-test and post-test can be seen as follows:

Table IV.1
Pre-test Score of Two Raters

No	Students	Speaking Skill														Total	Speaking Score	
		Accent			Grammar			Vocabulary			Fluency			Comprehension				
		Rater		Score	Rater		Score	Rater		Score	Rater		Score	Rater				Score
		1	2		1	2		1	2		1	2		1	2			
1	Student 1	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	200	40
2	Student 2	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	3	50	220	44
3	Student 3	3	3	60	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	3	3	60	250	50
4	Student 4	3	2	50	2	2	40	3	2	50	2	3	50	3	3	60	250	50
5	Student 5	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	3	60	220	44
6	Student 6	3	2	50	2	2	40	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	3	50	230	46
7	Student 7	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	200	40
8	Student 8	2	3	50	2	3	50	2	3	50	2	3	50	2	3	50	250	50
9	Student 9	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	210	42
10	Student 10	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	3	50	2	3	50	2	3	50	240	48
11	Student 11	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	3	50	2	2	40	210	42
12	Student 12	3	2	50	2	2	40	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	3	50	230	46
13	Student 13	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	200	40
14	Student 14	2	2	40	3	2	50	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	3	50	230	46
15	Student 15	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	210	42
16	Student 16	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	200	40
17	Student 17	3	2	50	3	2	50	4	3	70	4	3	70	4	3	70	310	62
18	Student 18	2	2	40	3	2	50	3	2	50	2	2	40	3	2	50	230	46
19	Student 19	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	210	42
20	Student 20	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	200	40
21	Student 21	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	200	40
22	Student 22	2	3	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	3	50	220	44
23	Student 23	2	3	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	3	2	50	230	46
24	Student 24	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	200	40
25	Student 25	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	210	42
26	Student 26	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	210	42
27	Student 27	2	2	40	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	220	44
28	Student 28	2	2	40	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	2	50	220	44
29	Student 29	2	3	50	2	3	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	3	50	230	46
30	Student 30	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	2	40	2	3	50	210	42
	Total																	1330

From the table IV.1 it was found that the students' score of pre-test assessed by the two raters was very low. It means that the students' speaking

ability was still low before using Face to Face Interaction technique. In order to read the data easily, the pre-test score can be seen as in the following:

Table IV.2
The Distribution of Frequency of Students' Pre-test Scores

Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
40	7	23.3 %
42	7	23.3 %
44	5	16.67 %
46	6	20 %
48	1	3.33 %
50	3	10 %
62	1	3.33 %
Total	30 Students	100 %

The Table IV.2 shows that 7 students got score 40 (23.3%), 7 students got score 42 (23.3%), 5 students got score 44 (16.67%), 6 students got score 46 (20%), 1 student got score 48 (3.33%), 3 students got score 50 (10%), and 1 student got score 62 (3.33 %). The data indicated that 7 students got the highest frequency or obtained score 40 and 42 from the total frequency 30 students. 40 was the lowest score obtained by the students. Based on the data obtained, there was 1 student who ≥ 60 . It means only 1 student reached the passing standard score (SKL) stated by senior high school of Al-Huda Pekanbaru.

Table IV.3
Post-test Score of Two Raters

No	Students	Speaking Skill														Total	Speaking Score	
		Accent			Grammar			Vocabulary			Fluency			Comprehension				
		Rater		Score	Rater		Score	Rater		Score	Rater		Score	Rater				Score
		1	2		1	2		1	2		1	2		1	2			
1	Student 1	2	2	40	3	4	70	2	3	50	3	3	60	4	5	90	310	62
2	Student 2	3	2	50	4	3	70	3	3	60	3	3	60	4	4	80	320	64
3	Student 3	2	2	40	3	3	60	3	3	60	3	3	60	4	4	80	300	60
4	Student 4	3	3	60	4	3	70	4	4	80	4	4	80	5	4	90	380	76
5	Student 5	3	3	60	4	4	80	4	4	80	5	4	90	5	4	90	400	80
6	Student 6	3	3	60	3	3	60	4	3	70	4	3	70	4	5	90	350	70
7	Student 7	4	4	80	4	4	80	4	5	90	4	3	70	4	4	80	400	80
8	Student 8	3	4	70	2	3	50	2	2	40	3	3	60	4	4	80	300	60
9	Student 9	4	4	80	4	4	80	3	5	80	3	3	60	4	3	70	370	74
10	Student 10	4	4	80	4	3	70	4	4	80	3	3	60	4	4	80	370	74
11	Student 11	4	4	80	4	3	70	4	3	70	4	3	70	3	4	70	360	72
12	Student 12	4	4	80	3	3	60	4	3	70	3	2	50	4	4	80	340	68
13	Student 13	3	3	60	3	3	60	2	2	40	2	3	50	3	4	70	280	56
14	Student 14	3	3	60	4	3	70	4	3	70	2	3	50	4	4	80	330	66
15	Student 15	2	3	50	3	3	60	4	4	80	2	2	40	4	3	70	300	60
16	Student 16	4	3	70	4	4	80	3	4	70	4	3	70	4	5	90	380	76
17	Student 17	3	2	50	3	3	60	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	4	70	260	52
18	Student 18	3	3	60	3	3	60	2	3	50	2	3	50	3	4	70	290	58
19	Student 19	4	3	70	3	2	50	3	3	60	3	3	60	4	3	70	310	62
20	Student 20	3	3	60	3	3	60	4	3	70	3	3	60	4	3	70	320	64
21	Student 21	3	2	50	2	3	50	2	3	50	2	2	40	3	3	60	250	50
22	Student 22	3	2	50	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	3	60	240	48
23	Student 23	2	3	50	3	2	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	3	60	240	48
24	Student 24	3	3	60	4	3	70	3	3	60	3	2	50	4	3	70	310	62
25	Student 25	3	3	60	3	3	60	4	3	70	3	3	60	3	4	70	320	64
26	Student 26	4	3	70	3	3	60	4	3	70	3	3	60	4	4	80	340	68
27	Student 27	4	3	70	2	2	40	3	2	50	2	3	50	4	3	70	280	56
28	Student 28	2	3	50	2	2	40	2	2	40	3	3	60	4	3	70	260	52
29	Student 29	3	2	50	3	4	70	3	3	60	2	3	50	4	3	70	300	60
30	Student 30	3	4	70	3	3	60	2	3	50	3	2	50	3	4	70	300	60
Total																		1902

From the table IV.2 it was found that the students' score of post-test assessed by the two raters increased. It means that the students' speaking ability was better improvement after using Face to Face Interaction technique.

In order to read the data easily, the pos-test score can be seen as in the following:

Table IV.4
The Distribution of Frequency of Students' Post-test Scores

Score	Frequency	Percentage (%)
48	2	6.67 %
50	1	3.33 %
52	2	6.67 %
56	2	6.67 %
58	1	3.33 %
60	5	16.67 %
62	3	10 %
64	3	10 %
66	1	3.33 %
68	2	6.67 %
70	1	3.33 %
72	1	3.33 %
74	2	6.67 %
76	2	6.67 %
80	2	6.67 %
Total	30 Students	100 %

The Table IV.4 shows that 2 students got score 48 (6.67%), 1 student got score 50 (3.33%), 2 students got score 52 (6.67%), 2 students got score 56 (6.67%), 1 student got score 58 (3.33%), 5 students got score 60 (16.67%), 3 students got score 62 (10%), 3 students got score 64 (10%), 1 student got 66 (3.33%), 2 students got score 68 (6.67%), 1 student got score 70 (3.33 %), 1 student got score 72 (3.33%), 2 students got score 74 (6.67%), 2 students got score 76 (6.67 %) and 2 students got score 80 (6.67%). The data indicated that 5 students got the highest frequency or obtained score 60 from the total frequency of 30 students. 48 was the lowest score obtained by the students. Based on the data obtained, there were 22 students who ≥ 60 . It

means many students reached the passing standard score (SKL) stated by senior high school of Al-Huda Pekanbaru.

C. The Data Analysis

The data analysis is presented based on the statistical result followed by the discussion about the effect of Face to Face Interaction technique on the students' speaking ability at the first year of Senior High School of Al-Huda Pekanbaru. The data were divided into two parts, they were pre-test and post-test. To analyze the data, the mean score (M) and the standard deviation (SD) were analyzed by using t-test statistics manually.

1. Data Analysis of the Students' Ability before being Taught by Using Face to Face Interaction Technique in Pre-test

The data of students' pre-test were the scores of their speaking ability which were assessed based on the components of speaking in terms accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. The scores are displayed below:

Table IV.5
Students' Pre-test Scores

Score (X)	Frequency (f)	Passing Score
40	7	Failed
42	7	Failed
44	5	Failed
46	6	Failed
48	1	Failed
50	3	Failed
62	1	Passed
Total	30 Students	100

From the table IV.5, it was found that only one student reached the passing standard score or passed and the others failed. It means that the students' speaking ability before using Face to Face Interaction technique is very low.

2. Data Analysis of the Students' Ability after being Taught by Using Face to Face Interaction Technique in Post-test

The data of students' post-test were the scores of their speaking ability which were assessed based on the components of speaking in terms accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. The scores are displayed below:

Table IV.6
Students' Post-test Scores

Score (X)	Frequency (f)	Passing Score
48	2	Failed
50	1	Failed
52	2	Failed
56	2	Failed
58	1	Failed
60	5	Passed
62	3	Passed
64	3	Passed
66	1	Passed
68	2	Passed
70	1	Passed
72	1	Passed
74	2	Passed
76	2	Passed
80	2	Passed
Total	30 Students	

The table IV.6 shows that many students reached the passing score or passed, which were twenty two students and the others failed, which were eight students. It means that the students' speaking ability after

using Face to Face Interaction technique improved since there were many students who obtained the passing standard score.

3. The Difference between the Students' Speaking Ability before and after Being Taught by Using Face to Face Interaction Technique (Pre-test and Post-test Scores)

Table IV.7
The Difference of Mean of the Students' Pre-test and Post-test Scores

No	Student	Score (X)	Score (Y)
1	Student 1	40	62
2	Student 2	44	64
3	Student 3	50	60
4	Student 4	50	76
5	Student 5	44	80
6	Student 6	46	70
7	Student 7	40	80
8	Student 8	50	60
9	Student 9	42	74
10	Student 10	48	74
11	Student 11	42	72
12	Student 12	46	68
13	Student 13	40	56
14	Student 14	46	66
15	Student 15	42	60
16	Student 16	40	76
17	Student 17	62	52
18	Student 18	46	58
19	Student 19	42	62
20	Student 20	40	64
21	Student 21	40	50
22	Student 22	44	48
23	Student 23	46	48
24	Student 24	40	62
25	Student 25	42	64
26	Student 26	42	68
27	Student 27	44	56
28	Student 28	44	52
29	Student 29	46	60
30	Student 30	42	60
	Total	1330	1902
	Mean	44.33	63.40

The data obtained from the students' pre-test and post-test score were compared in term of mean. From the table IV.7, it was found that mean of the students' pre-test score was 44.33, and mean of students' post-test score was 63.44. It means that the students' speaking ability before using Face to Face Interaction technique did not reach the passing standard score, but the students' speaking ability after using Face to Face Interaction technique reached the passing standard score. In order to find out the significant difference between pre-test and post-test score, the analysis can be continued as follows:

Table IV.8
Mean, Standard Deviation, and Standard Error Mean

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 postexp	63.40	30	9.054	1.653
preexp	44.33	30	4.581	.836

It is clear that the mean score of post-test is higher than pre-test score. Furthermore, to find out whether there is significant difference or not, it can be seen as follows:

Table IV.9
Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 postexp - preexp	19.067	10.824	1.976	15.025	23.109	9.648	29	.000

Based on the table above, it can be seen that mean is 19.06. it means that the different mean between pre-test and post-test is 19.06, standard deviation is 10.83, t_{table} is 9.68 and df is 29. Then t_{table} is compared to t_{table} at level of 5% and 1%. At level of 5% is 2.04 and 2.76 at level of 1%. It can be read $2.04 < 9.68 > 2.76$. It means H^a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. The conclusion is there is significant difference on students' speaking ability before and after being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique at the first year of Senior High School Al-Huda Pekanbaru. In short, teaching speaking by using Face to Face Interaction technique gives better progress to the students' speaking ability.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusions

Based on the findings as described in chapter IV, research on the effect of Face to Face Interaction technique on students' speaking ability at the first year of senior high school Al-Huda Pekanbaru have completely discussed. It is necessary for the researcher to draft the conclusions as follows:

1. The students' ability in speaking before being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique is categorized into Poor level.
2. The students' speaking ability after being taught by using Face to Face Interaction is categorized into Good level.
3. The investigation of significant difference of students' speaking ability before and after being taught by Using Face to Face Interaction technique at the first year of senior high school Al-Huda Pekanbaru shows the analysis of T-Test formula where t_0 higher than Tt . It means that there is significant difference on students speaking ability after being taught by using Face to Face Interaction technique at the first year of senior high school Al-Huda Pekanbaru.

B. Suggestion

Based on the researched conclusions above, it is known that the use of Face to Face Interaction technique in the classroom can improve students' speaking ability. So that, teaching by using Face to Face Interaction is one of

the solutions for the English teacher in order to increase students' ability, especially the students' ability in speaking skill.

1. Suggestions for the teacher:
 - a. The teacher teaches constantly use Face to Face Interaction technique.
 - b. Teacher trains students to speak English during the teaching and learning process.
 - c. Teacher involves the students to speak English, such as questioning and answering activities, asking them to give the feedbacks about the questions, etc.
 - d. Teacher encourages students' awareness about the importance of speaking skill for their future career.
 - e. The building up of creative and enjoyable learning for students should be developed by the English teacher
 - f. Teacher should support their teaching strategies by using interesting and representative media.
2. Suggestions for the students:
 - a. The students are expected to use English as the only one language, at least in learning English.
 - b. The students make such kinds of opportunities to practice English.
 - c. The students find other people that can increase their speaking ability.
 - d. The students never feel bored in practicing their English.

3. Suggestions for the other researchers:
 - a. The researchers are expected to find the new strategy, method or approach in order to make the students easy and enjoyed in learning English.
 - b. The researchers always watch the development of education.
 - c. The researchers are enforced to be agents of change in education.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. *Prosedur Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta. 2006.
- Begley, Kathleen A. *Face to Face Communication*. Boston: Thomson Netg. 2004.
- Brown, Douglas H. *Teaching by Principles on Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: San Fransisco State University. 2004.
- Cameron, Lynne. *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001.
- CressWell, John W. *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall. 2008.
- Gay, L.R., Peter Airasian. *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 2000.
- Harmer, Jeremy. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London and New York: Longman. 1985.
- Hartono. *Statistik Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar dan Zanafa. 2008.
- SPSS 16. *Analisis Data Statistika dan Penelitian*. Pekanbaru: Pustaka Pelajar. 2008
- [Http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/cooperative learning](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/cooperative_learning). Retrieved on December 2010.
- Hudson. R. A. *Sociolinguistic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1981.
- Hughes, Arthur. *Testing for language teachers*. Second edition. Cambridge: University Press, Cambridge. 2003.
- Kalantari, Reza. *Techniques for Classroom Interaction*, International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS), Vol 3(4). 2009.
- Littlewood, William. *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1991.
- Long, M.H. and Jack, C.R. *Methodology in TESOL*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers. 1987.
- Luoma, Sari. *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008.

- Nunan, David. *Language teaching Methodology*. London: Pearson Education Ltd. 2000.
- O'Malley, J.M, L.Valdez Pierce. *Authentic Assessment for Language Learners*. New York: Addison Wesley Publishing Company. 1996.
- Richards. Jack C. et al. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Longman Group. 1999.
- Th. M. Sudarwati and Eudia Grace. *Look Ahead: an English Course for Senior High School Students Year X*. Jakarta: Erlangga. 2007.
- Ur, Penny. *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2003.
- Weir, C.J. *Understanding and Developing Language Test*. New York: Prentice Hall. 1993.
- Widdowson, H.G. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1979.
- www. Encyclopedia.com. Retrieved on December 2010.