



ISSN 2830-3385 (Print)
ISSN 2830-3202 (Online)

BATARA DIDI: English Language Journal

Vol. 1 No. 1, 2022 (Page: 27-37)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56209/badi.v1i1.23>

Problem Based Learning Strategy for Better Speaking Ability

Saiful¹, Hamid Ismail², Rina Asrini Bakri³, Maharida¹

¹English Department, FKIP, Muhammadiyah University, Indonesia

²English Education Department, STKIP Kie Raha, Indonesia

³English Education Department, STKIP YPUP, Indonesia

Article History

Submitted: 11 April 2022

Revised: 21 May 2022

Accepted: 9 June 2022

Keywords

Better Speaking Ability,
Problem Based Learning,
English Speaking Strategy

Abstract

The objective of this study was to find out the increase of the students' speaking ability in SMAN 13 Gowa in mastery, the speaking ability by applying problem-based learning strategy. The research population of this study was the eleventh-grade students of SMAN 13 Gowa in academic year 2020/2021. It consisted of an 8 classes and total populations were 213 students. This research used the purposive sampling technique, and the class IX Social was chosen as the sample of the study. The total of sample were the 24 students. The instrument of this research was speaking test. Speaking test was given as pre-test before doing the treatment to know prior ability of the students and post-test after doing treatment to find out the students' speaking ability achievement by using problem-based learning strategy. The findings showed in pre-test that mean score of accuracy was 2,42, students' and the students mean score of comprehensibility was 2,42. The total students' mean score in pre-test was 4,83. In post-test, the students' mean score of accuracy was 2,96 and the students' mean score of comprehensibility was 3,63. The total students' mean score on post-test was 6,58. It can be concluded that the total mean score of students in post-test was higher than pre-test. The researcher concluded that the use of problem-based learning strategy improves the student's speaking ability and can be used for better speaking ability.

Introduction

Speaking is one of the difficult activities in learning English. It is one form to get information through oral communication in the world. It becomes more useful for everyone who wants to learn about English. In most conversations, the word flows with just the least of mental urge. People think about what to say, who they are talking to, where they are, and they also need to

¹Corresponding author: Saiful

Email: saiful@unismuh.ac.id

²Hamid Ismail

Email: hamidismail1961@gmail.com

³Rina Asrini Bakri

Email: rinaasrinistkip@gmail.com

⁴Maharida

Email: maharida@unismuh.ac.id

know how many times to talk. So, focusing on their accuracy and fluency is the main learning process to get developing of the students in their speaking performance (Dolmans et.al., 2016; Edens, 2000).

Moreover, the case that is faced by the teacher and students in SMAN 13 in learning English become complicated because the students must get optimal standard achievement and score KKM in speaking minimum 7.5 and majority students only get under 7 score KKM this is force the teacher to find out strategy in teaching and guide the students because they do not know what their aims to speak English, the condition and situation in the classroom have not been designed naturally for speaking, and the student still lack in use vocabulary, correct grammatical and acceptable interaction. Therefore, the teacher must regard how the classroom interaction should best be designed to cater the students' communication need (Dole et.al., 2016). In this case for improving the students' speaking ability, the researcher is going to carry out the research that emphasizes on the aspect of learning goal, creating the learning process, Xue, (2018), this strategy is the named "Problem Based Learning Strategy".

Some advantages when applying this strategy already written by some writers such as McLean, (2016) the students should be active in participating especially when teaching learning process is conducted then choosing to formulate the greater information, develop the source of information, consider to apply and reflect some of the students experience to determine how the knowledge and mind can be transferred to all situations. According to Kokotsaki et.al., (2016) claim that problem-based learning (PBL) is characterized by a student- as the centered approach, then the teacher as the "facilitators in the classroom activity rather than disseminators of the class activities, and open ended the kinds of problem that occur then "serve as the initial stimulus and framework for learning (Bone et.al., 2021; Major, 2018; Schettino, 2016). By some of the expert explanation above the researchers conclude that the teacher plays a critical role in handling and helping students in the classroom interaction to be self-directed learners that must create better atmosphere classroom in which students "receive systematic instructions in conceptual, strategic, and reflective learning and reasoning in the context of discipline to achieve goal that will ultimately make themselves more successful in later case problem investigation. PBL is good to try to be implemented to make the students become an independent learner which is try to solve their own problem on the case the find and they feel (Wang & Chen, 2018; Gurses et.al., 2015). This strategy will lead them to find the great solution and to fulfill and achieve the target school KKM. Based on the in the background above, the researcher then formulates the research question as follow: Can Problem Based Learning Improve Students Speaking Ability (Reimschise et.al., 2017; Hainey et.al., 2016).

Methods

The method that used in this research was pre-experimental method. This method consisted of three steps, namely pre-test, treatment, and post-test. It aimed to know whether or not Problem Based Learning Strategy improved students' speaking ability. The research design used an experimental design with non-equivalent control group design (Gay, 2006). It involved two groups. One received a new or usual treatment. Both of these groups got pre-test and post-test. The result of the treatment was compared in order to find out the effectiveness of the treatment. The design was presented as follows:

O1 X O2

Where; O1 = Pre-Test, X = Treatment, O2 = Post-test (source:)

The population of this research was the eleventh-grade students of SMAN 13 Gowa in academic year 2020/2021. It consisted of 8 classes and the total populations were 213 students. This research used purposive sampling technique, and the class IX Social was chosen as the sample. The reason for choosing this class as the sample because the students of this class had low ability in speaking than other classes. It was known because the researcher had done the observation before conducting this research, got information from teacher's interview result. The total of sample were 24 students. The instrument of this research was speaking test. Speaking test was given as pre-test before doing the treatment to know prior ability of the students and post-test after doing treatment to find out the students' speaking ability achievement by using problem-based learning strategy. The classifications of speaking ability were accuracy, and comprehensibility that are adopted from Heaton's classification (1989).

The procedure of collecting data was divided into three steps as follows: a) Before doing the treatment the students were given a pre-test that was speaking test to know prior ability. The students had a topic and they delivered the speech for two to five minutes. b) After giving pre-test, the students were given treatment through PBL. The treatment was conducted four times by using the following procedures such as giving the topic the researcher first explained about problem-based learning to the students 1) Giving the topics, 2) The researcher divided the students into small group. Presenting the topic: 1) The researcher gave chance to each group to talk one topic for each meeting, 2) The researcher gave time 15 minutes to each group to discuss one topic given. 3) After discussion the topic the researcher gave chance to each group for presenting the topic.

Applying Problem Base Learning: 1) After presenting the topic the researcher asked the question, comments or opinions about the topic that was presented by the students, 2) The researcher gave chance to all of the students to ask question, comments, or opinions about the topic that was presented by the students, 3) The students were given responds, correct answer, explanations and clarifications. At the last meeting, the researcher employed a post-test to find out the value on the progression of the students after giving treatment to know whether or not the result of post-test was better than result of the pre-test. The item and content of post-test was same as in the pre-test. The data were collected from the tests and analysed quantitatively.

The collecting data were analysed based on the following procedures: 1) Techniques of scoring system. To measure the students' speaking ability of the students on component observe involving accuracy, and comprehensibility the data was tabulated by referring the scoring system (Bodnar & Clark, 2017). as in following: 1) Score 5 is classified as very good, 2) Score 4 is classified as good, 3) Score 3 is classified as average, 4) Score 2 is classified as poor, 5) Score 1 is classified as very poor.

Rating score for the students' speaking ability in terms of accuracy dealing with pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary

Table 1. Students Classification Score in Accuracy

Score	Classification	Indicator
5	Very Good	Pronunciation is only slightly influenced by the mother tongue. Two or three minor grammatical and lexical errors
4	Good	Pronunciation is still moderately influenced by the mother tongue. a few minor grammatical and lexical errors but more utterances are correct
3	Average	Pronunciation seriously influenced the mother tongue but only a few serious phonological errors. Several grammatical and lexical errors, two or three major errors causing confusion

2	Poor	Pronunciation seriously influenced by the mother tongue with the errors causing a breakdown in communication. Many basic grammatical and lexical errors.
1	Very Poor	Serious pronunciation errors as well as many basic grammatical and lexical errors. No evidence of having mastered any of the language skill.

Table 2. Students Classification Score in Comprehensibility

Classification	Score	Indicator
Very good	5	The speakers' intention and general meaning are fairly clear. A few interruptions by the listener for shake of classification are necessary.
Good	4	Most of what the speaker says is easy to follow. His intention is always clear but several interruptions are necessary to help him to convey message or to seek classification
Average	3	The listener can understand a lot of what is said, but he most constantly seeks classification. Cannot understand many of speaker's more complex or longer sentences
Poor	2	Only small bits (usually short sentences and phrases) can be understood and then with considerable effort by someone who is listening to speaker.
Very poor	1	Hardly anything of what is said can be understood. Even when the listener makes a great effort of interruption, the speaker is unable to clarify anything seems to have said.

Results and Discussion

Students speaking scores in pre-test and post-test

The researcher gave the pre-test to the students before having the treatments by using problem-based learning. In pre-test, the students were asked to discuss the topics that had been given which aimed to know speaking ability of the students in two components namely accuracy, and comprehensibility. The post-test was given to the students after having the treatments which aimed to know the achievement of the students' speaking ability after they got the treatments.

Table 3. Scores of the two components of the students' speaking in pre-test

No	Name	Accuracy	Comprehensibility
1	AJB	3	3
2	MKH	3	2
3	LS	3	3
4	AMJ	3	3
5	BA	2	2
6	FB	2	2
7	FGK	2	2
8	MS	3	3
9	IA	2	3
10	BS	3	2
11	KMS	2	2
12	DCM	3	3
13	MDS	2	3
14	MSS	2	1
15	AS	2	2
16	G	3	3
17	MJ	2	3
18	DA	2	3
19	MA	2	2
20	S	3	2
21	AL	2	3

22	AM	2	1
23	JJ	3	3
24	GS	2	2

The table above shows the score of the two components of the students' speaking in pre-test. The students' speaking in accuracy there was none student got very good score, there was none student got good score, there were 10 students got average score, there were 14 students got poor score, and there was none student got very poor score. While the students' speaking in comprehensibility There was none student got very good score, there was none student got good score, there were 12 students got average score, there were 10 students got poor score, and there were 2 students got very poor score. After having the treatment, the researcher gave the post-test and the students were asked to discuss the topics that had been given to know speaking ability of the students in two components of speaking, there were accuracy and comprehensibility for knowing the students' speaking ability after doing treatment.

Table 4. Scores of the two Components of the Students' speaking in post-test

No	Name	Accuracy	Comprehensibility
1	AJB	4	4
2	MKH	3	3
3	LS	4	4
4	AMJ	3	4
5	BA	3	3
6	FB	2	3
7	FGK	2	3
8	MS	4	5
9	BS	3	3
10	KMS	4	4
11	DCM	2	3
12	MDS	4	5
13	MSS	3	3
14	AS	2	3
15	G	2	3
16	MJ	4	5
17	DA	3	4
18	MA	3	4
19	S	2	3
20	AL	3	4
21	AM	3	4
22	JJ	2	2
23	GS	4	5
24	FB	2	3

The table 4.2 above shows the score of the two components of the students' speaking in the post-test. The students' speaking in accuracy there was none student got very good score, there were 7 students got good score, there were 9 students got average score, there were 8 students got poor score, and there was none student got very poor score. While the students' speaking in comprehensibility there were 4 students got very good score, there were 8 students got good score, there were 11 students got average score, there was 1 student got poor score, and there was none student got very poor score.

The pretest was given to the students before having the treatments which aimed to know the prior speaking ability of the students. The post test was given to the students after having the treatments which aimed to know the achievement of the students speaking ability after they got the treatments. The researcher asked to the students to discuss the questions about the topic

that had been given in the pretest. The researcher found that there were some students still difficult in starting to speak. After they had done the pre-test, the researcher gave treatments for four meetings. The researcher gave four topics to the students. The topics that had been given were different in every time in the treatment. The researcher told about the function of problem based learning in speaking. The researcher gave the topic and gave 5 questions about the topics in the treatment. The researcher asked the students to discuss the questions about the topic that had been given in the post- test. The researcher found that there was significance different speaking ability of the students before and after having treatments.

Scoring Classification

The students' score in both the pre-test and the post-test in two elements of speaking were accuracy, and comprehensibility. They were classified into some criteria such as percentage, and frequency of the students. The following tables show the students' score of the pre-test and the post-test.

Pre-test

Table 5. Classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking accuracy in the pre-test result

NO	Classification	Score	Number of students frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very good	5	0	0
2	Good	4	0	0
3	Average	3	11	45,83
4	Poor	2	13	54,17
5	Very poor	1	0	0
Total			24	100

The table 4.4 above shows the classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking accuracy in the pre-test. It can be seen that there was none student (0%) got very good score, there was none (0%) got good score, there were 11 students out of 24 students (45,83%) got average score, there were 13 students out of 24 students (54,17%) got poor score, and there was none student (0%) got very poor score. The table above shows that most students stated in two levels. There were average level with 11 frequencies and there were poor levels with 13 frequencies.

Table 6. Classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking comprehensibility in the pre-test result

No	Classification	Score	Students frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very good	5	0	0
2	Good	4	0	0
3	Average	3	12	50
4	Poor	2	10	41,67
5	Very poor	1	2	8,33
Total			24	100

Table 4.5 above shows that the classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking comprehensibility in the pre test result. The researcher explains about the data that had collected in the pre-test, which the students' speaking in comprehensibility pre- test result, there was none student (0%) got very good score, there was none (0%) got good score. There were 12 students (50%) got average score. There were 10 students (41, 67%) got poor score,

and there were 2 students (8, 33%) got very poor score. The researcher concluded the table 3 above that, most students were in average level with 12 frequencies.

Post-test

Table 7. Classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking accuracy in the post-test result

No	Classification	Score	Students frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very good	5	0	0
2	Good	4	7	29,17
3	Average	3	9	37,5
4	Poor	2	8	33,33
5	Very poor	1	0	0
Total				100

The table 4.6 above shows the students' speaking score, frequency, and percentage in the post-test. In this case content post- test result there was none student (0%) got very good score, there were 7 students out of 24 students (29,17%) got good score, there were 9 students out of 24 students (37,5%) got average score, there were 8 students out of 24 students (33,33%) got poor score, and there was none student (0%) got very poor score. Based on the table above most students were in average level with 9 numbers of student frequencies.

Table 8. Classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking comprehensibility in the post-test result

No	Classification	Score	Students frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Very good	5	3	12,5
2	Good	4	8	33,33
3	Average	3	11	45,83
4	Poor	2	1	4,17
5	Very poor	1	1	4,17
Total			24	100

The table 4.7 above shows classification, score, frequency, percentage of the students' speaking comprehensibility in the post-test result. It can be seen that there were 3 students out of 24 students (12,5%) got very good score, there were 8 students out of 24 students (33,33%) got good score, there were 11 students out of 24 students (45,83%) got average score, there was 1 student out of 24 students (4,17%) got poor score, and there was 1 student out of 24 students (4,17%) got very poor score. Based on the table 8 above the researcher concluded. Most students were in average level. There were 11 numbers of student's frequencies.

Mean score on accuracy and comprehensibility in both pre-test and post-test

After calculating the results of the students' pre-test and post-test, the mean score of the students' pre-test and post-test were shown in the following table.

Table 9. The mean score of students' pre-test and post-test

Test	Total score	Mean score
Pre-test	116	4,83
Post-test	158	6,58

Based on the data in the table 9 above, it shows that total score of pre-tests mean score were 4,83 while the total score of post-tests were 6,58. Referring to the data shown, it can be inferred that the mean score of the students' pre-test was lower than post-test.

T-test Value

Finding out the significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test of students' speaking ability achievement after they had the treatments was presented in the following table:

Table 10. Students' speaking ability achievement

Variable	T-test	T-table
(X2-X1)	10,29	2.690

Based on the table 10 above explains the t-table was 2.690 and the t-test was 10,29. It could be concluded that t-table was smaller than t-test value of students speaking ability achievement. Referring to the data shown, it also could be inferred that there was significant difference between the result of the students' score in the pre-test and post-test. From the analysis above, the researcher concluded that there was significance different between the score got by the students in pre-test and post-test in speaking through problem-based learning. Teaching speaking through problem-based learning method could improve the student's speaking ability.

The researcher wants to describe about the students' data analysis obtained from the problem based learning test. The pre-test was done before doing the treatment. The data of both the pre-test and the post-test have been compared. The data of pre-test explained that most students were qualified as poor on the two elements of speaking. Based on the data that had been collected in the pre-test, the researcher took two components in speaking test; there were accuracy, and comprehensibility. Which the rate percentage of the students' pre-test on accuracy, there was none student (0%) got very good score, there was none (0%) got good score, there were 11 students (45,83%) got average score, there were 13 students (54,17%) got poor score, and there was none student (0%) got very poor score. The table above shows that most students stated in two levels. There were average level with 11 frequencies and there were poor levels with 13 frequencies. On comprehensibility, there was none student (0%) got very good score, there was none (0%) got good score, there were 12 students (50%) got average score, there were 10 students (41,67%) got poor score, and there were 2 students (8,33%) got very poor score. The table above shows that most students were in average level with 12 frequencies.

Most students' result in pretest on the two elements of speaking were qualified as average. The treatment was done four times. After having treatment, the students had post-test. The followings are the discussion of post-test result. On accuracy, there was none student (0%) got very good score, there were 7 (29,17%) got good score, there were 9 students (37,5%) got average score, there were 8 students (33,33%) got poor score, and there was none student (0%) got very poor score. On comprehensibility, there were 3 students (12,5%) got very good score, there were 8 students (33,33%) got good score, there were 11 students (45,83%) got average score, there was 1 student (4,17%) got poor score, and there was 1 student (4,17%) got very poor score. Based on the result of post-test, it could be concluded that most students were qualified as average on the two elements of speaking. The situation of the students' score of the students pre-test and post test on the speaking accuracy. There were 16 students out of 24 students got the increase score, 8 students out of 24 students whose score unchanged and no one of 24 students has lower score. It means that 66,67% students got improvement of their score and 33, 33% did not get improvement and 0% student got lower score. The situation of the students' score of the students' pre-test and post-test speaking comprehensibility. There were 18 students score increased, 6 students whose score unchanged. and no one of 24 students has lower score. It means that 75% students got improvement of their score and 25 % did not get improvement and 0% student got lower score.

Based on the students result in pre-test and post-test and also the students' situation score, the researcher concluded that the students' rate percentage of students pre-test was lower than the students' rate percentage post-test. The result of pre-test and post-test, the students' speaking ability achievement could also be known by the students' mean score of both pre-test and post-test. In pre-test, the mean score of accuracy was 2,42, students' and the students mean score of comprehensibility was 2,42. The total students' mean score in pre-test was 4,83. In post-test, the students' mean score of accuracy was 2,96 and the students' mean score of comprehensibility was 3,63. The total students' mean score on post-test was 6,58. Comparing the total mean score of students in pre-test and post-test, it can be concluded that the total mean score of students in post-test was higher than pre-test. In other words, it can be said that $6,58 > 4,83$. The value should also be compared are the t-test and t-table. The t-test of this research was 9,36 while the t-table of this research was 2.690. The t-table of this research was smaller than t-test. After knowing the data of pre-test and post-test, it is known that the score of post-test was higher than pre-test there is one value that also should be compared that the value of t-test and t-table. The data show that the value oft-test was higher than t-table. It explains that there was significance between the mean score of pre-test and post-test.

Based on the data above, the researcher concluded that, in two elements of speaking those are accuracy, and comprehensibility can improve students speaking' ability by using problem based learning method. The ability of the students' speaking through problem based learning method shows the total mean score of the students' speaking ability without problem based learning method were 4.83 . The total mean score of the students' speaking ability through problem based learning method were 6.58. It can be concluded that the students' speaking ability text after teaching speaking by using problem based learning method was higher than the students' speaking ability without problem based learning text method. The students' speaking on the two components in pre-test and post-test as follows: 1) The mean score of the students' speaking accuracy of post-test was 2,96 while the students' mean score of pre-test was 2,42. It shows that the students' mean score of pre-test was greater than pre-test on accuracy element of speaking. 2) The mean score of the students' speaking on comprehensibility of post-test was 3,63 while the students' mean score of pre-test was 2,42, it shows that the students' mean score of post-test was greater than the students' mean score of pre-test on comprehensibility element of speaking.

Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis and findings in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that: Problem Based Learning Strategy (PBL) as one of the strategies in teaching is crucial and significant in improving speaking ability in term of students' speaking accuracy and comprehensibility. Using problem-based learning can improve the students' speaking ability of the eleventh-grade students of SMAN 13 Gowa. Before being taught problem-based learning method, the students' achievement in the speaking was classified as poor It can be seen from 16 students (66, 67%) get very good score, there were 6 students (25%) get good score, there were 2 students (8, 33%) get average score, there was none student (0%) get poor score, and there was none student (0%) get very poor score.

The students' achievement in speaking in post-test was classified as fair score, there are 23 students (95, 83%) get very good score, there is 1 student (4, 17%) got good score, there is none student (0%) get average score, there is none student (0%) get poor score, and there is none student (0%) get very poor score These data indicated that the score of the post-test is higher than pre-test. Based on the result of data above the researcher concluded that, the use of

Problem Based Learning Can Improve Students' Speaking Ability and the use of this strategy is better for students' speaking.

References

- Bodnar, C. A., & Clark, R. M. (2017). Can game-based learning enhance engineering communication skills?. *IEEE transactions on professional communication*, 60(1), 24-41. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2016.2632838>
- Bone, Don, Valerie Gay, Wayne Brookes, Franziska Trede, and Robin Braun. "Roadshow Presentations for Developing Presentation and Feedback Skills in Studio Based Learning." In *2021 19th International Conference on Information Technology Based Higher Education and Training (ITHET)*, pp. 01-11. IEEE, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITHET50392.2021.9759758>
- Dole, S., Bloom, L., & Kowalske, K. (2016). Transforming pedagogy: Changing perspectives from teacher-centered to learner-centered. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 10(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1538>
- Dolmans, D. H., Loyens, S. M., Marcq, H., & Gijbels, D. (2016). Deep and surface learning in problem-based learning: a review of the literature. *Advances in health sciences education*, 21(5), 1087-1112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-015-9645-6>
- Edens, K. M. (2000). Preparing problem solvers for the 21st century through problem-based learning. *College Teaching*, 48(2), 55-60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550009595813>
- Gurses, A., Dogar, C., & Geyik, E. (2015). Teaching of the concept of enthalpy using problem based learning approach. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 2390-2394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.298>
- Hainey, T., Connolly, T. M., Boyle, E. A., Wilson, A., & Razak, A. (2016). A systematic literature review of games-based learning empirical evidence in primary education. *Computers & Education*, 102, 202-223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.09.001>
- Kokotsaki, D., Menzies, V., & Wiggins, A. (2016). Project-based learning: A review of the literature. *Improving schools*, 19(3), 267-277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480216659733>
- Major, T. (2018). Problem-based learning pedagogies in teacher education: The case of Botswana. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 12(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1543>
- McLean, S. F. (2016). Case-based learning and its application in medical and health-care fields: a review of worldwide literature. *Journal of medical education and curricular development*, 3, JMECD-S20377. <https://doi.org/10.4137/JMECD.S20377>
- Reimschisel, T., Herring, A. L., Huang, J., & Minor, T. J. (2017). A systematic review of the published literature on team-based learning in health professions education. *Medical teacher*, 39(12), 1227-1237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2017.1340636>

- Schettino, C. (2016). A framework for problem-based learning: Teaching mathematics with a relational problem-based pedagogy. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 10(2), 12. <https://doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1602>
- Wang, D., & Chen, J. (2018). Supervised speech separation based on deep learning: An overview. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 26(10), 1702-1726. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TASLP.2018.2842159>
- Xue, Y., Jiang, J., Zhao, B., & Ma, T. (2018). A self-adaptive artificial bee colony algorithm based on global best for global optimization. *Soft Computing*, 22(9), 2935-2952. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-017-2547-1>
- Yusuf, R., Sanusi, R., Maimun, B. A., & Putra, I. (2020). Critical thinking and learning outcomes through problem based learning model based on LBK application. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 12(12), 907-918. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v5i5.1242>