THE IMPLEMENTATION OF APPROXIMATIVE SYSTEM OF ENGLISH FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN SPEAKING SKILL

Abdillah and Raudoh

Abstract. *The objective of this research was to find out the improvement of the students ability in speaking skill English foreign language by implementation approximative system. The research conductied by using classroom action research. The subject of this study was students of eleventh grade. The class consisted of 30 students. The data were taken from the students score, observation sheet, diary notes and documentation. Based on the speaking tests, the students' score kept improvement in every test, it could be seen from the improvement of students' mean score from pre – test, post test of cycle I and post test cycle II. In the pre-test, students who got up 65 there were 5 of 30 students (16.66%). In the post-test of cycle I, Students who got up 65 there were 25 of 30 (83.33%). It means that there was improvement 66.67%. In the post-test of cycle II, students who got up 65 there were 29 of 30 students (96.66%). The improvement was about 13.33 %. The total improvement of the students score pre-test to post-test of cycle II was 80%. The improvement also can be proved by the result of observation sheet and diary notes, it showed that the expressions of the result of observation sheet and diary notes, it showed that the expressions of the students, they more active, enthusiastic, brave, confidence to respond and comprehend the text in learning process. Therefore, it was found that teaching speaking of English foreign language by implementation of approximative system could improve the students' ability in speaking skill.*

I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

One of language skill aspects which are very important in yielding creative, critical and smart future generation is speaking skill. By mastering speaking skill the students will be able to express their thought and feeling intelligently based on the situation and context when they speak about the language.

Speaking is the delivery of language through the mouth. To speak, we create sounds using many parts of our body, including the lungs, vocal tract, vocal chords, tongue, teeth and lips. One important thing to learn when speaking in English is to learn pronunciation. In developing pronunciation, we learn to pronounce the sound, intonation, word stress, sentence stress and others. Learn to pronounce the sound in English is good and really necessary because there are some pronunciation sound different with Indonesian and local languages we are.

But in fact, after I saw at school MA sei kepayang very much from the students who are not fluent in speaking English is good and right according to the rules that exist in the English language. Do not deny it can happen because of lack of access to school facilities and infrastructure to support teaching and learning in the school. In addition, teachers who teach there is only one teacher for all classes ranging from middleweight up to the advanced class. So that teachers lacked creativity was good and active in the learning process the teacher did not give a good motivation which is important only conveyed materials no matter it can be understood, or understood by their students. which ultimately resulted in inhibition of the ability of students - his speaking.

To make students able to speak in English is good and right should teachers prepare everything from systems, strategies and methods appropriate to the learning process, especially in learning English. In this study, researchers will apply approximative system in English foreign language. To develop students' ability to speak in English.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Approximative Systems of Foreign Language

1. Defenition of Approximative Systems of Foreign Language

The language systems represent in a contact situation can be classified in accordance or agreement with their functions as: (1) The *target* language is that in which communication is being attempted, in the case of a learner it is the language he is learning when he uses it, (2) The*source* language is that acting as a source of interference (deviations from norm of the target language), it is normally the learner's language, (3) An *approximative system* is the deviant or ignore linguistic system actually employed by the learners attempting to utilize or use the target language. (Richards C. Jack:1973:55).

Such approximative systems change in character and accordance or agreement with proficiency level, variation is also introduced by learning experience (including exposure to target language script system), communication function, personal learning characteristic, etc. Clearly, there are some symbols can be used to be understood the statements above, those are: (1) LT: Target Language, (2) LS: Source Language, (3) An approxiamtive System and (4) Indices referring to systems at successive or continuous stages of proficiency. William Nemser, (in Richard, 1971: 56). Also Nemser's description of approximative system was based on three assumpstions :

1. Learner speech at a given time is the patterned product of a linguistic system, L_a (approximative system), distinct from L_s and L_t and internally structured.

2. L_a' s at successive stages of learning form an evolving series, $L_{a1} \dots n,$ the earliest occurring when a learner first attemps to use L_t (merger, the achievement of perfect proficiency, is rare in adult learners).

3. In a given contact situation, the L_a 's of learners at the same stage of proficiency roughly coincide, with major variations ascribable to differences in learning experience (Nemser 1974 : 56).

Approximative system a term used by Nemser to refer to the deviant linguistics system which the learner employs when trying to use the target language. The learner passes through a number of approximative system on the way to acquiring full target language proficiency. (Tavakoli :25).

As Bloomfield's description of speech – communities the approximative system as language variety, with their interacting geographical, social and occupational subgroups, leaves, unclear the status of his " foreign speakers " (Bloomfield 1933 : 42v-56).

It means that, the learners who study about the other language, so it will be their second language for example, the learners who study about English language therefore it is as the target language.

2. The Concepts of Approximative Systems

Selinker emphases not just the existence of interlanguage but also where it comes from. He looks for it is origin in the processes through which the mind acquires a second language. ([1]Selinker, Larry. 1972). L2 learning differs from first language acquisition in that it is seldom completely successful, *5* percents of L2 framers have 'absolute success' in his view. The L2 'fossilizes' at some point short of the knowledge of the native speaker, for example 'German Time–Place order after the verb in the English IL of German speakers'. SeIinker (1972) proposes that the lucky *5* percent of successful L2 learners take advantage of a 'latent language structure' in the mind like that used in first language acquisition, that is to say the LAD. The 95 percent of learners who are less successful rely on a psychological structure also latent in the brain and activate when one attempts to learn a second language, but distinct from the latent language structure. Interlanguage therefore attempts to explain the fossilization in the L2 learner's system noted by both Nemser and Selinker. Both interlanguage and approximative system lay stress on the change in the learner's language system over time. According to Selinker (1972), the

difference between interlanguage and Nemser's approximative system is that interlanguage does not necessarily converge on the target language.

Selinker, (1972) claims that interlanguage depends on five central processes these are parts of the latent psychological structure:

a. *Language transfer,* in which the learner projects features of the L1 on to the L2.

b. *Overgeneralization of L2 rules,* in which the learner tries to use L2 rules in ways which it does not permit.

c. *Transfer of training,* when teaching creates language rules that are not part of the L2, as when a teacher's over-use of "he" discourages the students from using "she".

d. *strategies of L2 learning,* such as simplification, for example when the learner 'simplifies' English so that all verbs may occur in the present continuous, yielding sentences such as "I'm hearing him".

e. *Communication strategies,* such as when the learner omits communicatively redundant grammatical items and produces "It was nice, nice trailer, big one", leaving out "a".

The crucial insight contributed by Selinker is not the actual processes that he puts forward, but his insistence that an explanation is called for in terms of the processes and properties of the mind. He postulates not only an independent grammar but also a psychological mechanism for creating and using it. Transfer is only one of at least five processes involved in interlanguage in the individual mind. Selinker (1972) is also ambiguous about whether the five processes are for the creation of interlanguage or for its use, witness remarks such as 'He would like to hypothesis these five processes are processes which are central to second language learning, and that each process forces fossil sable material upon surface IL utterances. (Corder, 1978, p.71: http : // w.w.w. teaching styles online.com).

3. The Factors of Approximative Systems

The small amount of research and speculation about learners' approximative systems term from Nemser, (in Richards, 1971: 3) Suggests that seven factors may influence and characterize these second language learners systems. These factors are discussed bellows.

a. Language Transfer

The first factor is language transfer. Sentences in the target language may exhibit inferences from the mother tongue. Predicting errors by comparing the linguistic systems and the target language. George, (in Ricards, 1971: 5) finds that one-third of the deviant sentences from second language learners could be attributed to language transfer. This of course was considered to be the major, but not the only, source of difficulty by linguists doing contractive analysis. Interference analysis tends to be from the deviant sentence back to the mother tongue. Contractive analysis works the other way, predicting errors by comparing the linguistic systems of the mother tongue and target language

b. Intralingua Interference

The second factor, intralingua interference by (Richards, 1970: 6), refers to items produced by the learner which reflect not the structure of mother tongue, but generalizations based on partial exposure to target language. Richard (1971a) found systematic intralingua errors to involve overgeneralization, ignorance or rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules, and semantics errors. These have been quantified for Thai learners of English by Brudhiprabha (1972). These studies suggest that many intralingua error represent the learning difficulty of what are often low level rules in the target language, such as differences between the verb inflection in I walk, she walks, it may be inferred that once basic rules such as those concerning subject – object relationship, predication, negation, etc.

c. Sociolinguistic Situation

The third factor is the sociolinguistic situation. Different settings for language use result in different degrees and types of language learning. These may be distinguished in terms of the effects of the socio-cultural setting on the learner's language in term of relationship holding between the learner and the target language community and the respective linguistic markers of these relations and identities. Included here are thus the effects of the learner's particular motivations for learning the second language as well as the effects of the socio-cultural setting.

The distinctions of compound /co-ordinate bilingualism, Wein-reich, 1953, Ervin and Osgood, 1954, Lambert 1961 (in Richard, 1971: 7) rests upon an assumption that different setting for language learning may motivate different processes of language learning. For example, two languages may be learned in the same socio-cultural setting or in two different setting.

d. Modality

The learners' language may vary according to the fourth factor, the modality of exposure to target language and modality of production. Production and perception may involve acquisition of two partially over lapping systems. Nemser's research suggests that two different systems may be internalized in the target language depending on the modality. He found that in the productive modality, phonological replacements differed depending on whether the learner is imitating utterances he hears or producing speech spontaneously.(Nemser, 1971a).

e. Age

The fifth factor which may affect the approximative system of the second language learner is his age. Some aspects of the child's learning capacities change as he grows older and these may affect language learning. The child's memory spans increase age. He acquires a greater number of abstract concepts, and he uses these to interpret his experience. Lenneberg (in Richard, 1967: 11) notes a period primary

language acquisition, postulated to be biologically determined, beginning when the child starts walking and continuing until puberty.

f.   Succession of approximative systems

The sixth factor concerns the lack of stability of the learner's approximative systems. Such systems are usually unstable in given individuals. Since here is invariably continuing improvement learning the target language. Because the circumstances from individual language learning are never identical. The acquisition of new lexical, phonological and syntactic items varies from one individual to another. Whinnom, (in Richard, 1971: 12) since most studies of second language learners systems have dealt with the leaner's production rather than his comprehension of language, the question also arises as to whether the grammar by which the learner understands speech is the same as that by which he produces speech, since as we see above, modality may the influence the type of system developed.

Developing system / approximative system

"Developing " or" approximative system" is a term used for L2 learners' mental representations at any given time during acquisition. That is, a learner's developing system is that learner's internal and unconscious representation of the language (including, for example, components related to syntax, morphology, phonology, lexicon, pragmatics, and so on).

g.   Universal Hierarchy of Difficulty

Unlike the factors characteristic of approximative systems so far. The seventh factor receives little attention in the literature of second language acquisition. This factor is concerned with the inherent difficulty for man of certain phonological, syntactic or semantic and structure. Some forms may be inherently difficult to learn no matter what the background of the learner.

The concept of difficulty may be presumed to affect the learner's organization of what he perceives (for which the term learning strategy may be useful) and the

organization of what the produces (for which the term communication strategy may be used). Focusing on learning strategies direct attention to the cues which learner uses to identify elements in the new language. As Torrey, (in Richards, 1971: 13) comments, many aspects of language learning are very difficult to analyze into specific responses even where it is possible the responses are various and at different level (one item may belong to two level in one language and four in another) degrees of learning will be examined in term of specific instances rather than with the general category of responses. What the learner finds difficult will also depend on the degree and nature of what has acquired of the second language.

h. Significance Of Learner Systems

In short, the seven factors discussed above suggest that the approximative systems of language learners are much richer in linguistic, pedagogic, and social significance than heretofore suspected. While approximative system of language learners may be studied as entities worthy of attention in and of themselves, the results of such study should also provide feedback to language teaching practice and to general linguistic theory.

B. Speaking Skill

A human is a social creature who needs to socialize each other. They want to convey something or to know something from others. One of the ways is through speaking. Speaking as the primary skill is not the same as writing. It is widely known that in writing each student can work individually without disturbing the rest of the class. However, in speaking each student needs to speak. They need partners, so that the rest of the class may listen to him, respond him, and even support him.

The meaning: ″O consorts of the prophet! Ye are not like any of the (other) women: if ye do fear (Allah), be not too complacent of speech, lest one in whose heart is a disease should be moved with desire: but speak ye a speech (that is) just″.

So, speaking is really important. In learning English, speaking is used to deliver our mind for the foreigner. Furthermore, English is the international language used in this world. How much fun it would be t speak not only Indonesia, it would be great to be able to speak to people from other parts of the worlds (Conrad J. Schmitt, Glencoe McGraw Hill:1988:2).

According to Chomsky, (in Brown, 2008: 33) Speaking skill is the capability to other the articulation to express, to state or deliver though, opinion and wish to the other person. The People who know a language called as speaker of the language. Speaking includes all other kinds of knowing and many activities of foreign language learners are primary interest to speak.

Classroom activities that develop learners skill to express themselves through speak, it seems that an important component of language skill. The students face many problems in learning this skill, so that the teacher should help the students to solve this, such as; giving students some instructions by using easy language, avoid using beyond language than your students and keeping the students use the target language.

Therefore, as the foreign language learners are demonstrated for many decades, but as an English teachers have to keep in mind that the student unable to predict the all because the student and retaining. So that way, they need to know new words, structures, and concepts.

In teaching oral communication the writer does the instruction for students' attention to express their speaking skill in implementing of approximate systems of foreign language that will be created in form of groups work talking. After that, they will discuss with their friends and from each groups will has representation to talk about the material is being taught it is conducted repeatedly. The researcher also helps students to talk about what the material to be taught. Then, the researcher necessary to give them the treatment that what they are able to express the material in form of picture and also the picture must be related with their material to be taught.

Through this case, between the researcher and learners will be easier to do this activity.

C. Relevant Study

In this part, the researcher states the closely-related study which is relevance with this study in some cases, such described bellows:

Siti Maulida Nopriyana conducts a study with the title"The Implementation of Pragmatic Approach in Increasing Students' Speaking Ability for the Eighth Grade of *SMPN 4 Medan* In the School Year/2010". The study is attempted to find out the implementation of pragmatic approach in teaching speaking ability for the eighth grade of *SMPN 4 Medan* in the school year 2006/2007. The researcher's design of the study is Classroom Action Research (CAR) that is aimed at describing how pragmatic approach increase students' speaking ability for the eighth grade of *SMPN 4 Medan* in the school year 2006/2007.

The finding of Siti Maulida Nopriyana study is concluded that the mean score of cycle I and II are 63 and 65, 6 and the result of observation pointed that the teaching and learning process is very active. Those results prove that the pragmatic approach able to be implemented to the students' in increasing speaking skill.

After knowing the relevant study above, these studies are the same with my research in research design that is using Classroom Action Research (CAR). However, Siti Maulida Nopriyana study uses pragmatic approach to increase students 'speaking ability and the researcher's study uses approximative systems of foreign language in the same teaching.

III. RESEARCH METHODLOGY

A. The Time and Place of Research

This research was conducted at Mas. Al-wasliyah Sei Kepayang which located on Sei Kepayang street, Asahan regency. This school consisted of four rooms which is

two classes X, one class XI, one class XII. The total number of students are amount 137 students. The research will be conducted at the first semester Grade XI in Academic Years 2016/ 2017.

The researcher choose this location because some reasons, namely :

1. It was found in this school that the students' mastery in speaking needs to increase

2. The English teacher never use Approximative System in teaching learning English

3. The position of this school nearly from big street.

The research method that was used in this study is classroom action research. The research choose this method because classroom action research begin with a question about classroom experience and best on my theoretical framework classroom activities that develop learners skill to express themselves through speak, it seems that an important component of language skill , issues and challenging. It is a reflective process which helps teachers to explore and aspects of teaching and learning to take action change and apply the approximative system in teaching learning process. The writer as a research and her partner as an observer note all of the process in learning activities (Arikunto, Suharsimi:2002:31).

According to Arikunto classroom Action Research is coming from three words they are: research, action, and class. Research, action, and class. Research is an activity to find out accuracy some object using methodology which interest and important for the writer. Action is some activities deliberately done by having several aims, in the research in form activities cycles. Class is a group of students in some time have some lesson from teacher.

From the definition above, the researcher concludes that classroom action research that done by the in teaching learning process to know the situation of students when they are teaching learning process. Because the research interest and choose that CAR to methodology for this research. Therefore, in action research was

needed to use cycle. Every cycles consist of four steps, namely planning, action, observation and reflection as could be showed in the following:

a. Planning

Planning meant the reflection of the action was done. It was included plan details about data that was collected by the researcher and the preparation about all facilities and equipment in teaching learning process.

b. Action

Action meant the activities that was done. It was the implementation of project the researcher. Action was guided by planning the sense that it look back to plan for its rationale. Action was thus pluid, and dynamic, requiring, instant decision about was to be done and how the exercise of practical judgment.

c. Observation

It was the research of the action that was done. If for shadow the improvement of reflection. It had function of documenting the effect of critically informed action it looks forward, providing the basis for reflection. In this aspect the researcher must be able to observe every action. Response, attitude, of the all actions and tasks given to them.

d. Reflection

It was the evaluation of actions that has been done. It was recalled action as it had been recorded in observation. It was evaluated aspect, it asked action research to weigh the experience to judge the whether effects were desirable and suggest ways of producting (Kunandar.; 2008:48).

B. The Procedure of the Research

1. Cycle 1:

a. Planning

In this step, the researcher also prepared the instruments such as materials, syllabus, lesson plan, worksheet, learning scenario, technique and the instrument to observe and evaluate the teaching and learning process.

1) The Syllabus for the materials were given in this study were three kinds of tense namely: Simple present, past tense and present continuous tense. For the first cycle, the materials of these tenses are using paragraph in form of narrative and descriptive texts. The second cycle was taught in form of narrative texts that the students talked are the story talks about. The theme varied but refers to the tense.

2) Lesson Plan

The researcher make lesson plan about implementation of approximative system in english foreign language in speaking skill.

b. Acting

After knowing the problem faced by the students of *MA SEI KEPAYANG* for eleventh grade students who have low scores in speaking, the researcher conducted the action that has been planned. The action was aimed at solving the problem that has been made-up. Therefore, the teacher and the researcher played group work in implementing of approximative systems in teaching and learning process.

c. Observing

Observing is the time of collecting data to supervise to what extent the result of acting achieves the objective after being taught through approximative system of foreign language. In this aspect the researcher must be able to observe every action. Response, attitude, of the all actions and tasks given to them.

d. Reflecting

This activity is evaluating about the change of students' success in learning situation and teacher. This case, the data gained from the test and the result of observation which was interpreted and analyzed whether the action activity results in the progress, successfulness. The analysis is to know the weakness on the cycle I. the writer could make the clear and accurate conclusion. Then the result of reflection was used to determine the second cycle (cycle II) to get the improvement of the action.

2. Cycle 2

a. Planning

The activities are:

1) Learn the results of reflection on the cycle I, which be inputted in the action more effective and efficient in cycle II.

2) In cycle II, the things that needed to be prepared in essentially the same as planning in cycle I, differing only in material or sub concepts that was studied and revised the improvement of learning results from reflection of cycle I.

b. Action

Action was implemented in cycle II in essentially the same as cycle II, but differs in materials or sub concepts, implementation of action plans based on what has been designed or made.

c. Observation

The activities of observation were conducted from starting up to finish of action with such procedures in the cycle I.

d. Reflection

Reflection on the cycle II was essentially the same as cycle I, the differences was material or sub concepts that was studied. Meanwhile, in the cycle II was an improvement of cycle I and cycle II. In according with the results of reflection in every previous cycle, if reflection exhaustiveness of qualified in the cycle II defined

the implementation of the action is stopped, but if still not successful it will be proceed to the next cycle. (Wiriaadmadja 2008: 56).

C. Instrument of the Study

The instrument of these research were :

1. Test

In collecting the data, multiple choice test was used. The students was asked to answer the question the question of multiple choice test, which related to the lesson that have learned multiple choice test was gave in the pre test, post test cycle 1 and post test cycle 2. The time which gave to them to finish the test was 30 minutes.

2. Interview

Interview is conversation get information, usually get consisted of two person or more. Interview was conducted to get information of the students' achievement in speaking skill before giving the treatment.

3. Observation

Collection the data with using participant observation is showing to express the meaning of the haven't is the essential in qualitative observation. Research observe have a role to observe the object of research such as place of organization, group of people or some activities at school. Observation was used to identify all condition that happen during the teaching and learning process.

4. Documentation

Documentation is anything written that contains information serving as proof. According to Syahrum and Salimi their book, documentation is all of datas are collected and interpreted by researcher. And they also supported by some medias such as: photos, diary notes and video which will be related to research focusing.

D. Scoring to Test Speaking

The test was oral tests. There were 6 picture cartoon for each cycle. In scoring the speaking test, it was determined that the ranging from 30-100 by accounting the criteria of speaking. Those four elements are in line with what Brown states about the aspects of assessing speaking: grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, pronunciation, and task. The students' speaking performances were assessed using a scoring rubric adapted from J. Michael O'Malley and Pierce L. Vendez as it is cited in Hertati Mukadimah (2014:28-29).

So, the result of speaking skill to high if the students gets the criteria score minimal get the point to 65 based on KKM, and the criteria success get the points up to 75.

E. Techniques of Analysis Data

Data analysis is an effort which is done by the teacher and researcher to embrace the data accurately (Igak Wadani and Kuswaya; 2001:`8). This data was quantitative and qualitative data. The qualitative data was used to describe the situation during the teaching process and the quantitative data was used to analyze to score of the students. The qualitative data was analyzed from, interview, observation, documentation to describe improvement of students speaking skill. The quantitative data was collected and analyzed by computing the score of speaking test.

IV. RESEARCH FINDING

The result was indicated that there was an improvement students' ability in speaking comprehension of English foreign language by implementation approximative system. It supported by the fact of the mean from the score in every meeting increased. The mean of the first cycle was 66.67%. It was very low because the student still had many difficulties in speaking skill English foreign language., and

they had challenges to adapt between the new system and many system or strategy from their real teacher before. From the result above, the first cycle got the mean 72.83 % and the second cycle was 85.5. It was indicated that the scores and meant in second cycle were better then before (first cycle). The percentage of students who got point up to 65 also grew up. In the pre – test, students who got point up to 65 also grew up. In the pre – test, students who got up 65 there were only 5 of 30 students (16.66 %). In the post test of cycle 1, there were 25 of 30students who got up > 65 (83.33 %). It means that there was improvement about 66.67 %. In the post test of cycle II, there were 29 of 30 students who got up > 65 (96.66 %). The improvement was about 13.33 %. The total improvement of the students' score pre test to post test of cycle II was 80 %. In other words, the students was became better in the first meeting to next meeting by implementation by implementation approximative system.

V. CONCLUTION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Base on the result of the research, it be concluded the following points, they are:

1. The students' ability in speaking English foreign language before using approximative system is still low and fact of having fallen behind. In this case can be showed from pre – test, they just got up 65 there were 5 of 30 students (16.66 %).

2. Students' ability can be increased by implementation of approximative system. It could be see from result of this mini research. The result was showed the improvement of students score from pre test to post test of cycle II. The percentage of students who got point up to 65 also grew up. In the pre – test, students who got point up to 65 also grew up. In the pre – test, students who got up 65 there were only 5 of 30 students (16.66 %). In the post test of cycle 1, there were 25 of 30students who got up > 65 (83.33 %). It means that there was improvement about 66.67 %. In

18

the post test of cycle II, there were 29 of 30 students who got up > 65 (96.66 %). The improvement was about 13.33 %. The total improvement of the students' score pre test to post test of cycle II was 80 %. In other words, the students were become better in the first meeting to next meeting by implementation by implementation approximative system.

B. Suggestion

On this occasion, the researcher would like to give some suggestion to the stakeholders and the other researcher. It can get benefits from this research. The suggestions are as follow:

1. The students, it is the better to make a group discustion to share their opinion and it make the students more active in learning process, so that the students don't get bored, because generally, they just write the explanation from their teachers that wrote on the black board, it is so monotonously.

2. The English teacher, should be implemented strategy in learning about speaking so that the students can more actively, enthusiastically and enjoy during teaching learning process. The last, the material can be gotten by the students easier.

3. The Principle to give direction to English teachers about there are some strategy or system in English teaching that suitable for students. One of them is approximative system, that contributed on the students' ability in speaking skill of English foreign language.

4. Other researcher, the finding of this research is subject matters which can be developed widely and deeply by adding other variable or to enlarge the samples.

References

Alessondro G. Benati & Patten Van Bill, *in second Language Acquisition* (London, New York : 2010) hal 80

Arif Rahman and Team Al-Huda (editor), *Al-Qur'an Tiga Bahasa: Arab-Indonesia-Inggris plus Transliterasi Arab Latin),* (Depok: Penerbit Al-Huda, 2011), p: 157

Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2002): *Procedures Pendleton SuatuPendekatan Praktek .Edisi Revisi Jakarta*: PT Rineka Cipta. P.31

Conrad J. Schmitt, Glencoe Mc Graw Hill, *Invitation to language (Foreign Language Exploratory Program)*, (New York: 1998), p: 2

Damir Kalogjera Vladimir Ivin Languages in Contract and Contrast : in Contract Linguistics, *hal. 553*

Hertati Mukadimah. (2014).*Thesis of The Use of Talking Chips Strategy to Improve Speaking Ability of Grade XI Students of SMAN 1 Pengasih in The Academic Year of 2013/ 2014*. Yogyakarta: State University of Yogyakarta. p. 28-29

http://eprints.uny.ac.id/9137/3/bab%202-07202244038.pdf / 2017/22/01/4.17 wib

Igak Wadani and Kuswaya. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. (Jakarta: BumiAkasara, 2001). p.18

Kunanda r.*LangkahMudah PTK Pengembangan Profesi Guru*. Jakarta: PT. Rja Grafindo Persada, 2008. p. 48

Krzeszowski P. Tomasz, *Contracting Language the Scope of Constractive Linguistics* (Berlin, Newyork, 1990)

Kalogjera Damir & Ivir Vladimir, *Languages in Contract and Contrast : in Contract Linguistics* (Berlin, New York : Mouton the Gryler, 1991), p.351

Richards C. Jack, *error Analysis : Perspectives and Second Language Acquisition* (New York : Routledge, 20140)

Richards C. Jack , Error Analysis : *Perspective on Second Langauge Acquisition* (Cristopher N. Candlin. First edition, Longman 1973) p. 55

Richards C. Jack, Error Analysis*: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition* (New York : Routledge, 2014)

Selinker, Larry. 1972. ***Language transfer, general linguistics***.

Scoot, Thornburny.*How to Teach Speaking*.p. 127-129

Syahrum and Salim. 2011.*Metedologi Peneelitian Kuantitatif.*. Bandung ; Citapustaka Media

Tavakoli, Hossein*Dictionary of Language Acquisition : A Comprehensive Overview of Key Terms in First and Second Language Acquisition* (Teheran, Iran : Rahnama Press), page. 25