

# ***THE EFFECT OF SNOWBALL THROWING METHOD ON THE SPEAKING ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMPN 1 KUNTO DARUSSALAM***

**Nurkhairani, Effendy Gultom, Mahdum**

Email: nurkhairan08@gmail.com,effendygultom@gmail.com,mahdum1211@gmail.com

Contact: 082272459695

Student of English Language Education Department  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Universitas Riau

**Abstract :** *The purpose of this research is to know the effect of Snowball Throwing Method on the Speaking Ability of the Second Year Students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam. This research was pre-experimental design involving 30 students as a sample chosen through cluster random sampling technique. The data were gained before and after the treatment implementing Snowball Throwing Method. The students were given pre-test and post-test. The average score for pre-test was 40.75 and the average score for post-test was 61.11. The data shows that there are an increass from the pre-test and the post-test. The data analysis shows that the t-test is higher than t-table ( $17.424 > 2.045$ ) at the significant level of 5%. Therefore, alternative hipothesis is accepted and null hipothesis is rejected. It can be concluded that there is a significant effect of Snowball Throwing Method on the Speaking Ability of the Second Year Students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam.*

**Keywords:** *Effect, Ability, Snowball Throwing.*

# **PENGARUH TEKNIK BER CERITA TERHADAP KEMAMPUAN BERBICARA PADA SISWA TAHUN KEDUA DI SMP N 1 KUNTO DARUSSALAM**

**Nurkhairani, Effendy Gultom, Mahdum**

Email: nurkhairan08@gmail.com, effendygultom@gmail.com, mahdum1211@gmail.com  
Contact: 082272459695

Mahasiswa dari Program Studi Bahasa Inggris  
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan  
Universitas Riau

**Abstrak:** Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh metode snowball throwing terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa kelas dua SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam. Penelitian ini adalah desain pre-eksperimental yang melibatkan 30 siswa sebagai sampel yang dipilih melalui teknik cluster random sampling. Data diperoleh sebelum dan sesudah perlakuan menerapkan metode snowball throwing. Para siswa diberikan pre-test dan post-test. Skor rata-rata untuk pre-test adalah 40.75 dan skor rata-rata untuk post-test adalah 61.11. Data menunjukkan bahwa ada peningkatan dari pre-test dan post-test. Analisis data menunjukkan bahwa t-test lebih tinggi dari t-tabel ( $17.424 > 2.045$ ) pada tingkat 5%. Oleh karena itu alternatif hipotesis di terima dan nul hipotesis di tolak. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa ada pengaruh yang signifikan dari metode snowball throwing terhadap kemampuan berbicara siswa kelas dua SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam.

**Kata kunci:** Pengaruh, Kemampuan, Snowball Throwing.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Speaking is one of the important skills that must practice communicating orally. By speaking, people are able to know what the world situation. Speaking is considered to be one of the important of the four language skill. According to Fisher & Frey (2007), speaking is the uniquely human act or process of sharing and exchanging information, ideas, and emotions used in oral language. By speaking, people can communicate with others in order to share their feeling.

In Indonesia, English is taught as a compulsory subject from junior high school to university. Based on the 2013 curriculum, students are expected to be able to speak English. Flutcher (2003) says speaking is the verbal use of language to communicate with others. In addition, Harmer (2001) state speaking is a productive skill because students have to produce language themselves. It means speaking involves communicative performance, and other important elements, such as pronunciation, intonation, grammar, vocabulary, etc.

Learning English is not easy for junior high school the second year students have problems in speaking. Based on the researchers observation and interview 2018, the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam Kota Lama had difficulties in speaking ability because the students cannot speak well because they cannot pronounce the English word well, the students have lack of vocabulary, the students worried about making mistake and also the student's capability in mastering grammar is still low.

To solve the problem, the teacher should choose an appropriate method to make the students interested in learning speaking. One of the methods that teacher can use in teaching speaking is Snowball Throwing Method. Farrel and Jacobs (2010) State that snowball throwing is a useful cooperative learning method. It can motivate the students to have good capability in speaking. This is a good method to increase the student's speaking ability.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Participants of the Research**

The participants of this research were the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam. The researcher did the research on class VIII 1 which consisted of 30 students. The sample was selected by using random sampling technique.

### **The Data Collection Technique**

In collecting the data, Spoken test was used as a research instrument. Brown (2004) states that test is a method of measuring a person's ability or knowledge in a given domain. In short, speaking test is run to obtaine students' speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam.

The data were obtained from pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was measured before the treatment and post-test was measured after the treatment. In data collection technique, the research procedure can be described as follows:

1. Pre-test  
Pre-test was given to the students before the treatment. The purpose of pre-test was to find out the score of the students' speaking ability in speaking test. The pre-test was a speaking test about picture describing with the following topics: Animals and people profession.
2. Treatment  
Treatment was given by using Snowball Throwing method. The treatment was conducted in four meetings. In this step picture describing using Snowball Throwing Method. The teacher introducing the topic, divided students in groups, distribute the picture about the topic; animal and people professions, introducing snowball throwing method, asked the students to make a question based on the topic, throw the ball to another students, answer the question based on the ball.
3. Post-test  
Post-test was used to measure whether there is a significant effect of Snowball Throwing on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam in speaking or not.
4. transcription  
The researchers was used the performance record of the students' pre-test and post-test when they answer the question in front of the class by using voice recorder.

### The Data Analyzing Technique

The purpose of this research is to find out whether there is an effect of snowball throwing method on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam or not. Three raters were asked to assess the students' speaking test in order to have valid data. They were Rika Husymi, S.Pd.I, Mega Hidayat, S.Pd and Ruslim, S.Pd.I.

According to Brown (2004), there are five aspects of speaking in order to assess students' speaking ability. The following scheme of rating scale has been used to measure the students' speaking achievement as in the following:

The classification of students scores is adapted from Brown (2004) as follows.

**Table. 1.4. A score of Speaking Aspects**

Aspect	Level	Description
Pronunciation	5	Clear pronunciation.
	4	Easy to understand the students' pronunciation.
	3	Pronunciation problem leads to misunderstanding.
	2	Very hard to understand because of the pronunciation problem.
	1	A serious problem in pronunciation, so it cannot be understood.
Grammar	5	Make a few noticeable errors of grammar.

	4	Sometimes makes grammatical errors and it influences the meaning.
	3	Makes frequent errors of grammar and should re-arrange the sentence.
	2	Grammar and errors make comprehension difficult.
	1	Errors in grammar are unintelligible.
Vocabulary	5	Correct use of vocabulary.
	4	Sometimes uses inappropriate words but still can be understood.
	3	Frequently uses the wrong words, conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary.
	2	Limitations of vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult.
	1	Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible.
Fluency	5	Speak fluently.
	4	The speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problems.
	3	Often stuttering, need to think first what to say.
	2	Usually hesitant and stutter, the sentence may be left uncompleted.
	1	Very stuttering.
Comprehension	5	Appears to understand everything without difficulty
	4	Understands nearly everything at normal speed, although repetition may be necessary.
	3	Understands most of what are students said with slower normal speed.
	2	Difficulty to understand what the students talk about even with frequent repetitions.
	1	Cannot understand the most students say.

This following formula was used to measure students' score in speaking ability:

$$SA = \frac{\text{Total Score (P + G + V + F + C)}}{5}$$

Where;

- SA = Speaking Ability
- P = Pronunciation
- G = Grammar
- V = Vocabulary

F = Fluency  
C = Comprehension

(Adopted from Harris, 1974)

Three raters were asked to measure the students' speaking score. Then, the researcher calculated the score from the three raters.

$$T = R1 + R2 + R3$$

Where:

T = Total Score of students  
R1 = Score from Rater 1  
R2 = Score from Rater 2  
R3 = Score from Rater 3

After getting total score from the raters, the researcher calculated the real score using the following formula:

$$RS = \frac{TS}{MS} \times 100$$

Where:

RS = Real Score for each Individual  
TS = Total Score of Writing Aspects  
MS = Maximum Score

This following formula was used to know the students' ability in writing:

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

Where:

X = the students' average score  
 $\sum x$  = the students' score  
N = the number of students

(Hatch & Farhady, 1982)

In doing this research, the data were calculated by using Microsoft Excel 2010 and analyzed by using SPSS 23.00 (Statistical Product and Service Solution). The researcher also used T-test in comparing the results of students' writing test through pre-test and post-test.

## **Research Findings**

The objective of this research is to find out whether there is an effect of Snowball Throwing Method on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam or not. This research was conducted in six meetings in which two meetings were for pre-test and post-test, and four others for treatment using Snowball Throwing Method.

The data for this research are obtained from a spoken test in pre-test and post-test. At the beginning of the research, pre-test was administered to measure the students' speaking ability. Then the researcher carried out the treatment by using Snowball Throwing Method. After the treatment, the students took in the post-test. The data from pre-test and post-test were analyzed afterwards to find out the difference between the two mean scores and the difference of the average scores.

The test results are presented to show the students' speaking ability for each aspect of speaking. There are five aspects of speaking that were assessed in the test which include pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The findings of this research is based on the data obtained from three raters who assessed the test by using a scoring rubric designed by Brown (2004).

The objective of this research is to find out whether there is an effect of Snowball Throwing Method on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam or not. This research was conducted in six meetings in which two meetings were for pre-test and post-test, and four others for treatment using Snowball Throwing Method.

The data for this research are obtained from a spoken test in pre-test and post-test. At the beginning of the research, pre-test was administered to measure the students' speaking ability. Then the researcher carried out the treatment by using Snowball Throwing Method. After the treatment, the students took in the post-test. The data from pre-test and post-test were analyzed afterwards to find out the difference between the two mean scores and the difference of the average scores.

The test results are presented to show the students' speaking ability for each aspect of speaking. There are five aspects of speaking that were assessed in the test which include pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The findings of this research is based on the data obtained from three raters who assessed the test by using a scoring rubric designed by Brown (2004).

## 1. The result of the Pre-Test

No	Students	Real score			The average of three raters Ree raters	Ability level
		R1	R2	R3		
1	AS	40	36	40	38.66666667	poor
2	ANS	44	36	40	40	poor
3	ATF	36	32	32	33.33333333	poor
4	DN	40	36	36	37.33333333	poor
5	DR	40	36	44	40	poor
6	FB	36	40	36	37.33333333	poor
7	IFF	48	52	52	50.66666667	average
8	JF	44	44	44	44	average
9	JP	40	40	44	41.33333333	average
10	JS	40	40	44	41.33333333	average
11	JB	36	44	32	37.33333333	poor
12	LN	36	44	36	38.66666667	poor
13	MU	40	40	36	38.66666667	poor
14	MY	40	52	32	41.33333333	average
15	MJM	44	52	32	42.66666667	average
16	NIS	44	52	36	44	average
17	PA	40	48	40	42.66666667	average
18	RI	40	44	40	41.33333333	average
19	RL	36	40	40	38.66666667	poor
20	RW	44	44	40	42.66666667	average
21	RA	32	32	40	34.66666667	poor
22	SL	40	40	36	38.66666667	poor
23	SC	40	36	40	38.66666667	poor
24	SO	44	44	44	44	average
25	TM	36	40	44	40	average
26	UA	40	44	48	44	average
27	WZP	40	40	44	41.33333333	average
28	YRS	40	52	44	45.33333333	average
29	YN	36	44	44	41.33333333	average
30	ZI	40	44	44	42.66666667	average
total		1196	1168	1104	1222.666667	poor
average		39.86	38.93	36.8	40.75555556	

At the beginning of the research, the pre-test was given to obtain the base score as the comparison of the data on post-test after the treatment. The result of the pre-test was evaluated by three raters. After the score from three raters were collected, the researcher calculated the score to know the students' speaking ability in picture describing. The result shows that the average score of the students' writing ability in pre-test is 40, 75. The data of students' average score on the aspects of writing are presented in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1 Students' Ability in Each aspect of Speaking in Pre-test**

No	Component of Speaking	Average (R1+R2+R3)	ability level
1	Pronunciation	34	Poor
2	Grammar	36.88	Poor
3	Vocabulary	45.77	mediocre
4	Fluency	39.77	Poor
5	Comprehension	47.33	Mediocre
<b>Total score average</b>		<b>40.75</b>	

Table 4.1 Shows that the students pre-test average score is 40.75. The highest score of the pre-test is in Comprehension aspect (47.33). The score of grammar aspect is 36.88, the score of vocabulary is 45.77, and the score of fluency aspect is 39.77. Then, the lowest score of the pre-test is in pronunciation aspect (34).

## 2. The Result of the Post-Test

No	Students	Real score			The average of three raters Ree raters	Ability level
		R1	R2	R3		
1	AS	44	56	52	50.66667	Poor
2	ANS	72	68	72	70.66667	Poor
3	ATF	56	64	68	62.66667	Poor
4	DN	60	64	64	62.66667	Poor
5	DR	60	56	56	57.33333	Poor
6	FB	52	60	56	56	Poor
7	IFF	80	80	76	78.66667	average
8	JF	64	72	64	66.66667	average
9	JP	60	76	60	65.33333	average
10	JS	60	76	60	65.33333	average
11	JB	56	60	68	61.33333	Poor
12	LN	56	52	56	54.66667	Poor
13	MU	60	52	52	54.66667	Poor
14	MY	68	60	52	60	average
15	MJM	72	76	68	72	average
16	NIS	64	52	56	57.33333	average
17	PA	80	76	68	74.66667	average
18	RI	56	72	68	65.33333	average
19	RL	64	48	56	56	Poor
20	RW	64	56	56	58.66667	average

21	RA	52	44	64	53.33333	Poor
22	SL	68	60	52	60	Poor
23	SC	60	60	72	64	Poor
24	SO	56	56	60	57.33333	average
25	TM	52	68	64	61.33333	average
26	UA	60	56	60	58.66667	average
27	WZP	52	44	48	48	average
28	YRS	60	56	72	62.66667	average
29	YN	60	64	72	65.33333	average
30	ZI	56	52	48	52	average
total		1824	1836	1840	1833.333	Poor
average		60.8	61.2	61.3	61.11111	

Post test was conducted after treatment. It was held to find out whether there is an effect of snowball throwing method on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam. The result of the post-test was also obtained from the three raters before being analyzed by the researcher. The result of each aspect of speaking ability is presented in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2. Student's Ability in Each Aspect of Speaking in the Post- Test**

No	Component of Speaking	Average (R1+R2+R3)
1	Pronunciation	58.44
2	Grammar	56.88
3	Vocabulary	66.22
4	Fluency	56.88
5	Comprehension	67.11
<b>Average Total Score</b>		<b>61.11</b>

Table 4.2 shows that the highest score of the post-test is in the Comprehension aspect (67.11). The score of pronunciation aspect is 58.44, and the score of vocabulary is 66.22. Then, the lowest score in the post-test are the grammar aspect and the fluency aspect (56.88). The table also indicates the average score (61.11).

### 1. The Comparison Between the Pre-Test and the Post-Test Result

The findings of this research shows positive result of the use of Snowball Throwing Method in students' speaking ability. The improvement in the students' speaking ability was shown through the pre-test and post-test result. The comparison of the pre-test and post-test score in each aspect of writing can be seen in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3 the Students' Average Scores for Each aspect of Speaking**

No	Component of Speaking	Pre- Test	Post- Test	Different Score
1	Pronunciation	34	58.44	24.44
2	Grammar	36.88	56.88	20
3	Vocabulary	45.77	66.22	20.45
4	Fluency	39.77	56.88	17.11
5	Comprehension	47.33	67.11	19.78

As shown in Table 4.3, the score of each aspect of speaking increased. The biggest score difference is in the pronunciation aspect (24.44). The vocabulary aspect increased 20.45, followed by grammar aspect (20) and comprehension aspect (19.78). The lowest score difference is in fluency aspect (17.11). These score differences proved that there is a significant effect of using Snowball Throwing Method on students' speaking ability.

### 3. The Result of T-Test

In this research, t-test was used to compare pre-test and post-test result in determining whether the hypothesis could be accepted or rejected. The t-test was also used to measure whether or not the treatment gave a significant effect on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam. The pre-test and post-test scores were analyzed by using paired t-test in SPSS version 23.

The mean of the pre-test score ( $O_1$ ) achieved by the second year students was 40.75. After the treatment (X) had been applied to the students, the students' writing ability improved. The improvement could be seen in their mean score as shown in the post-test result ( $O_2$ ) which was 61.11. In order to know the hypothesis could be accepted or not, the result of t-test formula was also required. The value of t-table on the df (degree of freedom) 29 is 2.045 with the level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 5%.

Table 4.4. T-test Table

**Paired Samples Test**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 posttest – pretest	20.35556	6.39859	1.16822	17.96628	22.74483	17.424	29	.000

From Table 4.4, the researcher found that the mean difference between the pre-test and post-test result is 20.35556. The standard deviation is 6.39859 and the standard error mean is 1.16822. The low standard deviation indicates that the data points tend to be very close to the mean. Furthermore, the value of standard error mean shows that the sample is representative.

The value of the t-test is 17.424. Meanwhile, the values of t-table on the df (degree of freedom) 29 is 2.045 with the level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 5%. The level of significance is  $17.424 > 2.045$ . Moreover, the Sig. (2-tailed) is .000 which is lower than 0.05. From the data analysis, it could be identified that if the p-output (sig.2-tailed) is lower than 0.05 and t-value is higher than t-table on significant level 5%, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted. So, it can be concluded that Snowball Throwing has a significant effect on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam.

## **A. Discussion**

The result of this study shows that the mean score of the post-test was higher than pre-test, (61.11 > 40.75). This result indicated that the students' score after receiving the treatment have significantly improved compared to the students' scores before the treatment. Then, the difference between before and after treatment reached a significant level after being examined by t-test. The data analysis showed that t-test was higher than t-table ( $17.424 > 2.045$ ).

Based on the research findings, the researcher concludes that applying Snowball Throwing is effective in teaching speaking on the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam. The students' speaking ability has improved in all aspects of speaking which includes pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. The highest score in post-test is comprehension. Along with the content aspect, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, aspects also improved. In line with the result, Farrel and Jacobs (2010) states that snowball throwing is a useful cooperative learning method. snowball throwing can help the students to speak the related details of the topic and also the students can easily tell and explain about the picture by looking at picture that the teacher give. The result of this research shows that Snowball Throwing improved the students' speaking ability.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Conclusions**

This research was conducted to find out whether there is a significant effect of Snowball Throwing Method on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam or not. This study was applied by using one group pre-test post-test design. There are 30 students in class VIII.1 were selected as the sample and taught speaking by using Snowball Throwing Method.

Based on the data analysis that has been explained, it can be concluded that Snowball Throwing Method is effective to improve the students' speaking ability especially in picture describing. The improvement of students' speaking ability after being taught by Snowball Throwing Method can be seen through the difference in the pre-test and post-test score. Students' mean score on the pre-test is 40.75 while on the post test is 61.11. The mean score increases 20.35. The improvement is also revealed through the t-test calculation where t-test is higher than t-table, the level of

significance is  $17.424 > 2.045$ . From these findings, it can be concluded that Snowball Throwing Method has a significant effect on the speaking ability of the second year students of SMPN 1 Kunto Darussalam

## **Recommendations**

Based on the research findings, Snowball Throwing Method has a significant effect on students' speaking ability. Therefore, the researcher suggests using Snowball Throwing Method in teaching and learning process to improve students' speaking ability. The teacher may use Snowball Throwing Method as an alternative method to improve students' speaking ability especially in picture describing. Before doing the activity, the teacher needs to prepare an effective lesson plan because a well-organized lesson plan will support the teaching and learning process to progressing well. Then, the teacher gives feedback and check the students' work so that the students can improve their speaking ability.

In addition, the teacher should be aware of the students' needs of mastering all of the aspects of speaking, namely, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. Based on the research findings, the lowest improvement is in grammar and fluency aspects. Thus, the teacher needs to pay more attention on the grammar and fluency aspect without ignoring other aspects.

The students may use Snowball Throwing Method to improve their speaking ability. Bayor (2010) states Snowball Throwing is one of the active learning method which in practice involves a lot of students. Moreover, the students need to pay attention to the teacher's explanation so that they can understand how to apply snowball throwing method.

Furthermore, as this research has many weaknesses, the researcher would like to invite other researchers to conduct the research in different areas. Snowball Throwing Method can be implemented in different grades. Even researchers may also use different methodology of research.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Bayor, A. 2010. Snowball Throwing. Retrieved January 06, 2014. From [http://akmaldebayor.blogspot.com/2010/05/snowball-throwing 08.html](http://akmaldebayor.blogspot.com/2010/05/snowball-throwing%2008.html).
- Brown, H.D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco State University. Longman
- Farrell, T. S. C., and Jacobs, M. G. 2010. *Essentials for Successful English Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Continuum.
- Fisher, D, and Frey, N. 2007. *Checking for Understanding: Formative Assessment Techniques for Your Classroom*.USA: ASCD

Flutcher, Glenn. 2003. *Testing Second Language Speaking*. Great Britain: Pearson Education.

Fraenkel, Jack R., and Norman E Wallen. 2008. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The practice of language teaching*. England: Addison Wesley Publishing Company

Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edn. Cambridge: Longman.

Jack C. Richards, *Teaching Listening and Speaking; From Theory to Practice*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).