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ABSTRACT
This research aims at proving whether or not teaching speaking skills using problem solving method can develop the students’ speaking skills of Grade XI at SMA Negeri 1 Ampibabo. The research employed a quantitative method with one class pretest-posttest design. The instrument of this research was a test. The populations of this research were the Grade XI students at SMA N 1 Ampibabo. The samples were 38 students of class XI IPA 1. The data of this research were collected by administering pretest and posttest. The results of the data analysis indicate that: the mean pretest score is 58.44, the mean posttest score is 67.13 and the t-counted value is 13.35. The t-critical value with a degree of freedom (df) 37 and significance level at 0.05 was 1.687. Based on the analysis above the alternative hypothesis of this research was accepted, because the t-counted value is greater than the t-table value (13.35>1.687). Thus, teaching speaking skills by using problem-solving method can significantly develop the students’ speaking skills.

1. Introduction
The researcher identified problems faced by the grade XI students at SMA Negeri 1 Ampibabo. The ability of the students in speaking is still low. The students’ difficulties occur when they speak English. This is caused by students’ limitations in mastering the component of speaking. They are fluency, accuracy, and appropriacy. Especially in fluency, students’ difficulty to express their ideas makes them speak slowly. It is also noted that students practice rarely. Based on the researcher’s observation, they only have a little chance to practice speaking English in the class so that they have no chance to speak in the target language.

Teacher plays important roles to solve the problems. There are many methods that a teacher can apply in teaching speaking skills in the classroom such as; small group discussion, drama, debate, film discussion, etc. Besides method, some factors can help the student to achieve the aims of studying English such as good environment (situation and condition) and facilities.

The learning process in the classroom will be most effective when teachers implement a proper method to teach the subject to the students (Riski, et. al 2018). Based on the expectation, the researcher used Problem Solving method to develop speaking skills and to motivate the students. The students were divided into group work. The students were given some materials to discuss.

Problem solving is directed toward the solving of a specific problem that involves both the formation of responses and the selection among possible responses. As stated by Rusnauka (2010) “Problem solving is a learner-centered activity, in which the students discuss the problem with their mates to find the solution”. They learn the language unconsciously because their attention is engaged by the activity.

The problem solving method need English teacher to teach the components of language and to involve in communication activities. The teachers gave opportunities for students to speak in their target language. Teachers gave some problems and students try to find a solution to the problem by group work. After that, they shared the solutions to the problem. All of these methods encourage students to participate in the classroom, so they are active to follow the
teaching-learning process. Concerning the above background, the researcher conducts a research in “Developing Speaking Skill through problem solving method of grade eleven students of SMA Negeri 1 Ampibabo”.

2. Previous Studies

To begin with Rahmat, English Study Program STKIP Siliwangi Bandung. He applied this technique to teaching speaking skills. In his research, he stated that speaking is one of the difficult skills in English where many students get difficulties in speaking because the teacher does not use a technique that is appropriate with the lesson. The use of a suitable technique in the teaching process makes the students interested and easy to understand English especially in speaking. His research subject is the Year Ten of SMA Bina Muda Cicalengka. He concludes that Applications of problem-solving methods in learning English speaking especially to improve speaking skills are effective methods to be used for educators. The result of this research shows that the students were more active to speak up in the classroom and at the same time the students can improve their ability to speak English. Problem solving method makes the teaching-learning process more attractive.

Another research about the method has been discussed by Oradee (2012), the title of her research is developing speaking skills using three communicative activities (discussion, problem solving and role playing). She combines the communication activities to develop students’ speaking skills. She stated that learners lack self-confidence and avoidance when communicating with native English speakers. The ability to speak is the most essential skill since it is the basis for communication and it is the most difficult skill. So the teacher must use the appropriate method. Her research subject is at a secondary school in Udon Thani, Thailand, classified by high, medium, and low according to their abilities of English speaking proficiency level. She concludes that teaching English speaking skills using the three communicative activities is a learning method focusing on the learner-centeredness because students work in small groups and solve the problem. Using this technique, students can have the opportunity to work together providing help to others while performing the activity. They can express themselves successfully, more confidence in speaking, and enjoyment can encourage them to participate more in learning. The results of this study supported the effectiveness of three communicative activities involving problem solving in developing English speaking skills.

3. Literature Review

There are some components of speaking that should be mastered by the students; they are accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. According to Heaton (1988:90) “Speaking should be supported by language components. The mastery of language components of speaking can help the students to speak”.

3.1 Fluency

When speaking, the teacher and students use particular words, which are arranged properly. The students are able to deliver what they want to express. So, the ideas that the students express can run smoothly. Someone cannot speak if they are poor in vocabulary. According to Davis (1989:7), fluency in speaking is activated through a series of situational dialogue, while Andersoon (1996:5) says that fluency means the learner is producing the text in ordinary situations, at a normal rate of speed not too fast, not to show with sufficient, accuracy to be understood by speakers of the language with a minimum effort.

Speaking fluency is an initial and important goal in language teaching. Fluency represents a major element in judging speakers’ ability and proficiency in EFL classes. Koponen and Riggenbach (2000) stated that “fluency in language assessment is comparable to continuity, smoothness, or evenness of speech without extreme breaks or hesitations”. Accordingly, EFL fluency instruction needs to be dealt with as an essential part of learners’ development.

EFL speaking fluency skills were categorized, according to (Badr, 2008; Smith, 2003), stated: speaking at a normal speed without stumbling over words and sounds with perfect English, conveying the speaker’s message in an easy, clear, and understandable way, using a simple language that suits the listener’s level, producing comprehensible sentences with no major complications, exposing ideas calmly and spontaneously, arguing persuasively, organizing the oral production both cognitively and physically, manifesting a certain number of hesitations, pauses, backtracking, and corrections, and using gap-fillers correctly.

A major issue that continues to challenge language instructors and researchers is how to ensure that learners can develop and foster their EFL speaking fluency skills (Ritonga, et. al., 2020). Widiati and Cahyono (2006) illustrated that EFL students need to feel they are able to use the language in real situations as it represents an intrinsic motivation for them. They added that certain features may arouse the speakers’ interest and attention to use the language spontaneously,
these features are (1) topic: the topic of the lesson must be of interest and importance for the students to be able to capture their interest and attention; (2) visual focus: it is much easier for the students to concentrate on thinking about something if they can see that something or at least some depicted or symbolic representation of it, sight is an extremely powerful and demanding sense; (3) open-ended: an open-ended task allows lots of students' responses during EFL speaking classes; (4) information-gaps: the transmission of new ideas from one participant to another does indeed occur in most real-time language-based transactions, and when this factor is built into a classroom language learning situation, it will be a challenge to add purpose and authenticity to the learning environment. Videos were found to decrease the gap that may be found during English speaking classes.

3.2 Accuracy

Accuracy is one of the components of speaking that is very important to be mastered by the students; good pronunciation in speaking can make the listener easy to understand what we are talking about. Good pronunciations mean that we speak without being influenced by our mother tongue. Brown (2001:268) states, “accuracy is achieved to some extent by allowing students to focus on the elements of phonology, and grammar.” It means that to get it, the students must know grammar.

The lack of grammatical errors when conveying information or a message may become another side of measuring accuracy. For Indonesian students, as a non-native speakers, however, it is difficult to pronounce English words accurately. It is caused by the influence of their mother tongue.

Researchers have always considered accuracy the most important oral ability. Their students are always asked to focus on the elements of correct phonology, grammar, pronunciation, and discourse. Students can achieve the elements by using the appropriate strategy, method, or media. According to Dormer (2013) "Increased English learner accuracy can be achieved by leading students through six stages of awareness. The first three awareness stages build up students’ motivation to improve, and the second three provide learners with crucial input for change. The final result is “sustained language awareness,” resulting in ongoing self-correction and improvement.

3.3 Appropriacy

The most important factor in communication is appropriacy. All the time people cannot use accurate language all the way because to err is human. We can understand that human makes mistakes many times. When humans gets knowledge about language properly at the time human used accurate language.

Appropriacy means speaking to a suitable situation or language used by suitable words. It means that appropriability is also useful to speak the language and by appropriacy, we can understand the general sense of communication. The researcher can conclude that appropriacy is an important way to express the thought and feeling with each other.

There are some researchers showed that the use of the technique can improve students’ speaking skills. One of the researchers is Hardianti (2013) that research to improve student’s speaking skills especially incomprehensibility through simulation techniques. The result of the research stated that “The use of simulation technique is effective in improving the students’ speaking skill. The students could speak more fluently and understand what the speaker says easily”.

3.4 Problem Solving

Problem-Solving method is a way of presenting the lesson by presenting the material as a starting point for the discussion of issues to be analyzed and synthesized in an attempt to find a solution or answer by the students. This method is not a new thing among education providers. According to Suryadharma (2010), “Problem solving is the result of the application of knowledge and procedures to a problem situation”. Problem solving is often found in the classroom or everyday life.

Problem solving is a mental process that involves discovering, analyzing, and solving problems. The ultimate goal of problem-solving is to overcome obstacles and find a solution that best resolves the issue. The best strategy for solving a problem depends largely on the unique situation. In some cases, people are better of learning everything they can about the issue and then using factual knowledge to come up with a solution. In other instances, creativity and insight are the best options. Further explained by Wijaya (2008), “Problem solving method is the use of a method in learning activities with road train students to face various problems, personal or individually to be solved alone or group together".
Based on the statement above the writer can conclude that problem solving can apply by using a group of work to discuss the solutions of the problem. The total knowledge available in a group is likely to be larger than that available in an individual. So that the use of group work better than individual because students can discuss by using English with their friend and it can make their speaking skill develop naturally.

The method used in teaching learning process must fulfill the characteristic of learning. As stated by M. Nur (2003) that “Characteristic of class that implements the learning is: 1) Students actively engaged in learning; 2) Students learn from their friends through group work, discussion, and mutual correction; 3) learning emphasize the open issue; 4) Students behavior is built on self-awareness and prize for the good behavior is self-satisfaction; 5) Students use critical thinking skill, creative and take responsibility in the effective teaching learning process; 6) An appreciation of the recognition of the students is expected”. Problem solving method fulfill this characteristic, where the students are more active than the teacher. The researcher believes that it can make develop their speaking skills because when someone wants to master the English language, they have to practice the language as often as possible because by practicing they can accustom to the language.

3.5 Steps of Problem Solving

The method of solving the problem namely is an active thinking process. The stages of problem solving according to Wena (2009) which is based on thought process can be explained as follows:

a) Understand the problem. Students are considered to understand the problem if they can determine what conditions are known, what is noting know/ask, and how the terms.

b) Plan or make inquiries. In making the questions, students need to determine in advance what is known to what will be asked. Besides, that can choose the concepts that have been studied to be used in completing problems encountered.

c) Responding to the problem of the questions that have been made in the previous stage. Each step is checked whether it is correct or not. In this way, students can be expected to seek their solutions.

d) Verification/checking back. The result obtained on completion of the previous stage was re-evaluated. At this stage, questions were raised whether the results were obtained by the given problem, if there is another solution or differently but still get the same results.

3.6 Learning Speaking Skill through Problem Solving Method

Problem solving activities provide a way to relate classroom learning to authentic situations. Problem solving can help students to develop decision-making skills, critical thinking, autonomy, communications, negotiations, team building, and personal responsibility for learning. Problems presented must be relevant and meaningful to allow for ownership in motivating students to seek out potential solutions. The learning task should relate to the larger course concepts.

In teaching learning process, the learner became the center of the activity. It fulfills the criteria of the lesson where the students are more active than the teacher. In solving the problem they discussed the problem by identifying the problem with their friends in group work. After knowing the problem, they try to develop a plan to solve the problem.

Problem solving can also be considered in a positive way to address a challenge wherein solving the problem is done with group work to accomplish a task. Problem solving can be used for developing communicative skills especially fluency because the students can practice the target language while talking about the. Therefore, problem solving can provide an opportunity for practice making quality choices and decisions. Creative problem solving can be used as a tool for learning how to solve real-world problems.

4. Method

4.1 Design of the Research

In this research, the researcher applied pre-experimental research. There was one class as the sample. The sample of this research is XI IPA students of SMA N 1 Ampibabo. Pretest and posttest given to the sample. The design of this research as proposed by Arikunto (2006:86) is as follows:

\[ E = O_1 \times X \times O_2 \]

Where: \( O_1 \): pretest
4.2 Population and Sample

a) Population

A population is an object of the research. The object can be people or things. The population is needed by every researcher when conducting research. The population is a complete set of elements (persons or objects) that possess some common characteristic defined by the sampling criteria established by the researcher. In this research, the researcher took the grade XI students of SMA Negeri 1 Ampibabo. The population of this research involved four parallel classes. They were XI IPA 1, XI IPA 2, XI IPA 3, XI IPA 4. The total number of each class was shown in the table:

| No. | Class   | Number of students |
|-----|---------|--------------------|
| 1.  | XI IPA 1| 38                 |
| 2.  | XI IPA 2| 35                 |
| 3.  | XI IPA 3| 33                 |
| 4.  | XI IPA 4| 30                 |
|     | Total   | 136                |

b) Sample

A sample is a portion of the population having certain characteristics or condition that is going to be measured. The researcher limits the population to conduct the research easily. In taking a sample of this research, the researcher employed a cluster sampling technique to decide the experimental class. She had chosen XI IPA 1 as a sample in this research.

4.3 Instruments of Data Collection

In collecting the data, the researcher used a test as the instrument of the research. The instruments which were applied by the researcher were pretest and posttest. Pretest was given to the students to measure their pre-speaking ability before getting the treatment. It was given before conducting the treatment while a post-test was given to the students by the researcher to measure the students’ speaking ability after the treatment.

4.4 The procedure of Data Collection

a) Test

The researcher conducted the test on the students to know and measure the students’ ability in speaking. They were pretest and posttest.

b) Pretest

Pretest gave at the first meeting in the experimental group before the researcher conducted the treatment. The purpose is to obtain students’ skills in speaking. The researcher gave five questions by a monologue and the students answered the question in front of the class.

c) Treatment

After giving the pretest, the researcher conducted the treatment to the students in the first meeting. It was conducted for eight meetings.

d) Posttest

At the end of the meeting, the writer gave a posttest after the treatment which consisted of the same test item as had been used in the pretest. Post-test was used for evaluation to measure the student’s achievement after the treatment.

e) Tape Recorder

The researcher used a tape recorder to record the student’s voice during the test. The scoring system is based on the recorded of the students.
f) The technique of Data Analysis

The researcher analyzed the data by using statistical analysis. It is used to analyze the test instrument result (pretest and posttest). She computed the individual score by using a formula by Arikunto (2002:276)

$$\Sigma = \frac{x}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

- $\Sigma$ = Standard score
- $x$ = student’s score
- $n$ = maximum score
- 100 = constant number

After the researcher obtained the standard score, she counted the mean score of the class. To get the mean score, she used a formula proposed by Arikunto (2006:307):

$$M = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

Where:

- $M$ = mean
- $\Sigma x$ = sum of standard score
- $N$ = number of students

In addition, after the researcher obtained the mean scores, she counted mean deviation by using formula proposed by Arikunto (2002:276), as follows:

$$Md = \frac{\Sigma d}{N}$$

Where:

- $Md$ = mean deviation (posttest – pretest)
- $\Sigma d$ = sum of deviation
- $N$ = number of students

After that, the square deviation was computed using the formula proposed by Arikunto (2006:277) as follows:

$$\sum x^2 d = \sum d^2 - \frac{(\Sigma d)^2}{N}$$

Where:

- $\Sigma x^2 d$ = sum of score deviation
- $\Sigma d^2$ = sum of score
- $N$ = number of students

Finally, after getting the result of deviation square, the researcher uses t-table test to find out the significant difference between the result of pretest and posttest as well as to prove either the hypothesis accept or rejected. The researcher uses the formula proposed by Arikunto (1989:249) as stated below:

$$t = \left(\frac{Md}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma x^2 d}{N(N - 1)}}}\right)$$

Where:

- $t$ = t count
Md  = mean deviation \((posttest – pretest)\) 
\[\sum x^2 d\]  = score of square deviation 
\(N\)  = number of students 
\(1\)  = constant number

5. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

To find out the results of the test, the researcher examined the students before and after treatment. The pre-test was used to measure the students’ speaking skills before treatment. A post-test was given after the class got the pretest. The test was focused on fluency. The results of pretest and posttest are presented in the following table:

| NO. | Name | Initial Score’s of Fluency | Category | Qualification |
|-----|------|---------------------------|----------|---------------|
| 1   | AGI  | 56                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 2   | AHM  | 75                        | Good     | Successful    |
| 3   | ARI  | 55                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 4   | ARN  | 41                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 5   | AYU  | 59                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 6   | AZL  | 61                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 7   | BEB  | 41                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 8   | DES  | 58                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 9   | ERW  | 56                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 10  | FAI  | 50                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 11  | FIN  | 60                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 12  | FTT  | 59                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 13  | HER  | 55                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 14  | IND  | 57                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 15  | IND  | 47                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 16  | IND  | 66                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 17  | RIM  | 56                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 18  | JIH  | 65                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 19  | LEN  | 58                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 20  | LUS  | 60                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 21  | MAG  | 66                        | Good     | Successful    |
| 22  | MAY  | 70                        | Good     | Successful    |
| 23  | MOH  | 41                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 24  | MOHS | 70                        | Good     | Successful    |
| 25  | MHK  | 68                        | Good     | Successful    |
| 26  | MUN  | 60                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 27  | NIM  | 75                        | Good     | Successful    |
| 28  | NIL  | 59                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 29  | RAI  | 55                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 30  | RIF  | 56                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 31  | RIZ  | 66                        | Good     | Successful    |
| 32  | RUT  | 56                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 33  | SUL  | 70                        | Good     | Successful    |
| 34  | TIN  | 55                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |
| 35  | VIV  | 56                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 36  | WAH  | 60                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 37  | WHAH | 65                        | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 38  | TAU  | 54                        | Poor     | Unsuccessful  |

Average \(58.44\) Fair Unsuccessful

Total Score \(\sum x = 2221\)

The mean score of the pretest was 58.44. Based on the score which was got by the students, the ability of the grade XI students of SMA Negeri 1 Ampibabo in fluency was fair and the qualification was unsuccessful.

➢ The Result of Posttest

After giving the treatment, the researcher administered a second test to the students. The result presentation of the posttest can be looked at in the following table:
By looking at the result of the mean score of the posttest, it is proved that the student’s achievement in the posttest or after treatment increased from 58.44 to 67.13 or from fair became good. It means that students’ fluency in speaking is successful after giving treatment.

➢ Deviation

After calculating the mean score of the student’s pretest and posttest, the researcher computed the deviation and the square deviation of the student’s score in pretest and posttest. The result is presented on the following table:

| NO. | Initial Name | Score’s of Fluency | Category | Qualification |
|-----|--------------|--------------------|----------|---------------|
| 1   | AGI          | 70                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 2   | AHM          | 86                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 3   | ARI          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 4   | ARN          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 5   | AYU          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 6   | AZL          | 66                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 7   | BEB          | 56                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 8   | DES          | 66                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 9   | ERW          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 10  | FAI          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 11  | FIN          | 68                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 12  | FIT          | 66                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 13  | HER          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 14  | IND          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 15  | IND          | 56                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 16  | IND          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 17  | IRM          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 18  | JIH          | 70                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 19  | LER          | 70                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 20  | LUS          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 21  | MAG          | 75                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 22  | MAY          | 75                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 23  | MOH          | 56                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 24  | MOHS         | 85                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 25  | MHK          | 85                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 26  | MUN          | 66                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 27  | NM           | 90                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 28  | NIL          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 29  | RAH          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 30  | RIF          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 31  | RIZ          | 70                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 32  | RUT          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 33  | SUL          | 80                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 34  | TIS          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 35  | VIV          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 36  | WAH          | 65                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |
| 37  | WAH          | 70                 | Good     | Successful    |
| 38  | TAU          | 60                 | Fair     | Unsuccessful  |

Average: 67.13 Good Successful

Total Score: \( \sum x = 2551 \)
The computation of the student’s mean deviation was presented below:

\[ Md = \frac{\sum d}{N} \]

\[ Md = \frac{330}{38} \]

\[ Md = 8.68 \]

Having counted the mean deviation, the researcher then calculated the square deviation which was presented below:

\[ \sum x^2d = \sum d^2 - \frac{(\sum d)^2}{N} \]

\[ \sum x^2d = 3478 - \frac{(330)^2}{38} \]

\[ \sum x^2d = 3478 - \frac{108900}{38} \]
\[ \sum x^2d = 3478 - 2865.78 \]
\[ = 612.22 \]

Furthermore, the writer needed to statistically analyze the data in order to know the difference between pretest and posttest. The computation was as follows:

\[ t = \frac{Md}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2d}{N(N-1)}}} \]
\[ t = \frac{8.68}{\sqrt{\frac{612.22}{38(38-1)}}} \]
\[ t = \frac{8.68}{\sqrt{\frac{612.22}{1466}}} \]
\[ t = \frac{8.68}{0.43} \]
\[ t = 19.65 \]
\[ t = 13.35 \]

To achieve the t-table value, the researcher applied interpolation formula because the degree of freedom (df) 38 (N-1) with level of significance of 0.05 cannot be found in the t-table list. The computation is as follows:

Degree of freedom = N - 1
= 38 - 1
= 37

Level of significance = 0.05

30 = 1.697
40 = 1.684
a = 37 - 30 = 7
b = 40 - 30 = 10
c = 1.697 - 1.684 = 0.013
\[ \frac{a}{b} \times c = \frac{7}{10} \times 0.013 \]
\[ = 0.0091 \]
\[ df (37) = 1.697 - 0.0091 \]
\[ t-table = 1.687 \]

Based upon the data analysis above, it showed that t-counted was 13.35 applying 0.05 level significance with df = 37, the researcher found that t-table was 1.687. Because t-counted was higher than t-table, it means that the researcher hypothesis was accepted. In the other word, by applying problem solving method can develop the speaking skill of the grade XI students of SMA Negeri 1 Ampibabo.

6. Conclusion

Application of problem-solving methods in learning English speaking specially to develop speaking skills is one of the effective methods to be used for educators. The use of problem solving method can develop the speaking skill of the
grade XI students of SMA Negeri 1 Ampibabo. This can be seen from the results of t-counted (13.35) which is higher than the t-table (1.687).
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