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The objective of this study is to reveal whether: (1) Problem Based Learning technique is more effective than Discussion technique to teach speaking; (2) The students having high self-actualization have better speaking skill than those having low self-actualization; and (3) There is an interaction between teaching techniques and students’ self-actualization in teaching speaking.

This research applied an experimental study. The research was done in Universitas Islam Kadiri (UNISKA) Kediri. The population was the second semester students in the academic year of 2014/2015 totally consisting of 80 students. The sampling used was cluster random sampling. The samples were 40 students where 20 students were in the experimental class (2.B1) and 20 students were in the control class (2.B2). Students in each class were categorized into two groups: students having high and low self-actualization. The instruments used were self-actualization questionnaire and speaking test which were designed by the researcher. Before being applied, those instruments had been tried out to know the readability of the test instruction, the validity and reliability of self-actualization questionnaire. The data obtained were analyzed using ANOVA 2x2 and continued by using TUKEY test.

The result of data analysis shows that: (1) Problem Based Learning technique is more effective than Discussion technique to teach speaking; (2) The students having high self-actualization have better speaking skill than those having low self-actualization; and (3) There is an interaction between teaching techniques and students’ self-actualization in teaching speaking.

Based on the result of the research, some suggestions can be considered by the teachers, the students, and the next researchers. Those suggestions are related to the clarity of teacher’s instructions, students’ bravery to ask, and the usage of another Problem Based Learning teaching step by the researchers. By considering the suggestions, it is hoped that any deviation of the result of the next research can be minimized.
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Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengungkap apakah: (1) **Problem Based Learning technique** lebih efektif daripada **Discussion technique** untuk mengajar speaking; (2) Mahasiswa yang memiliki tingkat aktualisasi yang tinggi memiliki kemampuan speaking yang lebih baik dari pada mahasiswa yang memiliki tingkat aktualisasi diri rendah; dan (3) ada sebuah interaksi antara teknik mengajar dan aktualisasi diri mahasiswa dalam pengajaran speaking.


Hasil analisis data menunjukkan bahwa: (1) **Problem Based Learning technique** lebih efektif daripada **Discussion technique** untuk mengajar speaking; (2) Mahasiswa yang memiliki tingkat aktualisasi diri tinggi memiliki kemampuan speaking yang lebih baik daripada yang memiliki tingkat aktualisasi diri rendah; dan (3) Terdapat interaksi antara teknik mengajar dan aktualisasi diri mahasiswa dalam pengajaran speaking.


**Kata kunci:** Problem Based Learning technique, Classroom Discussion technique, speaking, aktualisasi diri, penelitian eksperimental
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