



Improving Speaking Ability of Students in English Introduction Material Through Snowball Throwing Games in Class VII B SMPN 3 Surabaya

Endah Sri Kustiningsih

SMPN 3 Surabaya, Praban Street no.3, Surabaya 60275, Indonesia
endahkustin@gmail.com
Whatsapp number: 08121714529

How to Cite: Kustiningsih, E.S. (2019). Improving Speaking Ability of Students in English Introduction Material Through Snowball Throwing Games in Class VII B SMPN 3 Surabaya. *Indonesian Journal of Contemporary Education*, 1(1), 1-5.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: December 21st, 2018

Revised: January 18th, 2019

Accepted: January 28th, 2019

KEYWORDS

Snowball Throwing
English Speaking Ability
Class Action Research

ABSTRACT

The ability of students in class VII at SMPN 3 Surabaya to speak English is still low from year to year with indicators when expressing English verbally often stopping in the middle of a conversation, the average duration of speaking is under 5 minutes, using very limited vocabulary, lacking courage start talking in English both to the teacher and to classmates. The snowball throwing learning model is a type of cooperative learning that is designed like a ball throwing game. This method aims to provoke creativity in making questions while testing the absorption of material delivered by the group leader. By using the snowball throwing model in Classroom Action Research (CAR) conducted on students of class VII B in semester 1 of SMPN 3 Surabaya, it is expected that this game can improve students' speaking skills in English. Test instruments in the form of performance tests, formative and interviews were previously judged content by expert academics. From processing the formative performance test results in 2 cycles, the talk duration of students increased by an average of 8 minutes, mastery of vocabulary more with the use of diction better and correct, from the results of interviews showed students were more motivated to talk and learning was felt fun. It was concluded that the snowball throwing method was able to improve the speaking ability of VII B students of SMPN 3 Surabaya in English.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.



1. INTRODUCTION

English has different characteristics from exact sciences or social sciences, which lie in the function of language as a communication tool. This identifies that learning English is not only learning vocabulary and grammar in the sense of knowledge, but must try to apply and use it in daily activities as a means of communication (Hansen: 1984). In everyday life, people usually judge a person's English ability from speech. Someone who can smoothly convey ideas / ideas in English is said to be proficient in English (Ersoz, Aydan: 2000).

The ability to speak English in grade VII students of SMPN 3 Surabaya from year to year is still low. This is indicated by expressing ideas in English verbally often stopping in the middle of conversation, the average duration of speaking is under 5 minutes, using vocabulary is very limited, lack the courage to start speaking in English both to the teacher and to classmates (Suganda, et al: 2007). Besides that, because of the changing situation from elementary school to secondary school, it makes students able to adapt to their new environment.

This is based on the findings of researchers as English teachers in the previous year in class VII B which shows that students only answer the main ideas, are less able to develop answers and even ask in English. In short, the answers given by students do not indicate the limitations of ideas, but rather the ability to speak English is still low (Suganda, et al: 2007).

The English learning model by emphasizing the game pattern is proven to be able to further improve the ability of students to master teaching material, the level of acceptance of learning models that are not pure learning in the classroom makes students enjoy learning. Use the game in learning English very much It is recommended to build capabilities that are considered quite complex (Wright, Andrew et al: 1984).

Snowball throwing is a game that students have known before at the Elementary School level. In this game more emphasis is on students to use verbal communication than visual and motoric communication. Researchers try to improve students' speaking skills by using this game. It is expected to improve verbal communication in English so

that students' speaking skills in English can be improved.

With the background of the above explanation, the author conducted a classroom action research entitled "Improving the Speaking Ability of Students in English Material Introduction Through Snowball Throwing in Class VII B of SMP Negeri 3 Surabaya". This research is expected to provide benefits such as for teachers to be able to develop interesting learning methods for students so that they can motivate students to be more actively involved in learning English to improve students' speaking competencies.

English is a foreign language in Indonesia, therefore in learning, teacher ingenuity is needed in choosing strategies, models, and learning media. Lately, few teachers have paid attention to learning media in the form of games, even though games can be used as very interesting learning models. Andrew Wright, David Betteridge (Games, 1984) argues that language learning is a hard job. Hard work is needed at all times and must be generated at certain periods.

Aydan Ersoz (2000: 1) argues that language learning is a difficult task and can sometimes make learners frustrated. Constant effort is needed to understand, produce and manipulate the target language. The choice game means a lot to students because the game is an opportunity for students to practice the target language skills. The game greatly motivates students because they are fun and challenging. Furthermore they use language that is useful and meaningful in the actual context. The game also encourages and enhances togetherness and motivation because it is fun and interesting. They can be used to provide practice to all language skills and can be used by many types of communication.

W.R.Lee (1979: 2) argues that most games make students use language instead of thinking about the right form. The game should be placed at the center of a foreign language teaching program instead of being placed outside it. A similar opinion was said by Richard Amato, who believed the game to be fun but warned not to miss pedagogical values, especially in learning foreign languages. There are many benefits to using games. This can reduce confusion, making input more reduced (Richard-Amato 1988: 118).

Games are very motivating and entertaining, and they can give shy students more opportunities to express their opinions and their feelings (Hansen 1994: 118). The ability to speak English (speaking) is the ability to express, use English verbally with the use of English vocabulary as well as ideas / ideas that are conveyed well and correctly. Snowball Throwing game is a game that uses ball-shaped paper, containing questions that must be answered by players (students). Questions are arranged so students describe themselves according to the learning material. The paper contains questions that must be answered by the player. In this case the question is about name, place of birth date, address, age, hobby, etc. The paper will be thrown at the other players to answer the question. Media images can be seen as follows.



Picture 2. Snowball Throwing

2. METHODS

This research is Classroom Action Research using qualitative descriptive method. This research was taken at SMP Negeri 3 Surabaya which is located at Jl. Praban No. 3 Surabaya and the author's research conducted since July 2018 until August 2018 in semester 1 of the 2018/2019 academic year. Research procedures include steps namely planning (planning), implementation of actions (implementation of the action), observation (observation) and reflection (reflection). According to Kemmis and MC Taggart (1998) in Kantili (2003): 'Action research is trying out ideas in practice as a means of improvising and learning means curriculum, teaching and learning. Besides that, Kantili (2003) cites another definition according to MC Niff (1988) which explains that 'action research is a way of characterizing a loose set of activities that are designed to improve the quality of education'.

The research subjects were VII B grade students of SMP Negeri 3 Surabaya in the 2018/2019 school year with the number of students in the research class was 42 students consisting of 19 men and 23 women. While the other subjects studied were teachers presenting the subject matter itself, with a focus on research on how teaching techniques speak English through snowball throwing games.

Data taken in this study were obtained from:

- a. Report card grades for speaking students in semester 1 and 2 of grade VII.B (which the researcher teaches) the school year 2017/2018
- b. Scoring sheet for students to describe something through a snowball throwing game.
- c. The final test results were in the form of oral tests in the
- d. form of interviews.
- e. Researchers observed by observers.
- f. Students involved in the learning process.

Data types:

- a. Quantitative data in the form of oral tests in the form of interviews.
- b. Qualitative data that comes from interactions between students, or with teachers in the learning process. While student performance is assisted by structured observation sheets.

Data from observation sheets made by observers and observers notes during the implementation of learning actions in the classroom. Data from questionnaires made by the author. Data obtained by researchers to determine the level of students' ability to speak is:

- a. The student scoring sheet about the assessment of speaking ability in describing something that is in the media of snake ladder play.

- b. Observation sheet filled in by the observer when the researcher presents the material.
- c. Observation sheets are filled by observers about student participation during the learning process in the classroom.
- d. Final test results are in the form of oral tests.
- e. Notes made by researchers.

Data obtained through observation sheet observation by observers, then analyzed together to get a percentage that describes the increase in students' speaking ability after being given action.

The steps of data analysis in this study are:

- a. Calculate the percentage of students who have achieved 75% completeness and / or get the same or more than 80 final grades after being given the action. This activity is carried out at the end of each cycle (I and II).
- b. Comparing the percentage level of improvement in English speaking skills starting from speaking grades in semester 1, peer assessment sheets and final tests in the form of oral tests from cycles I and II.
- c. If there are deficiencies, the solution is sought, and if there are things that are already good, then they are maintained. This reflection activity is not only carried out at the end of each cycle, but at the end of each meeting to find out developments. The results of this reflection are the material for planning research activities in the next cycle.
- d. Criteria for Success
The criteria for success in this study are if students get a final grade = or> of 80 in the final test conducted at the end of the activity in each cycle.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CYCLE I

In meeting I the researcher gives grammar learning actions asking for opinion 'and' request 'as semester repetition material 1. Emphasis on its use orally in practice in pairs.

In the second meeting the researchers provide learning actions Descriptive Text. Studied Adjective, Adverbs, Simple Present Tense. Emphasis on training to describe something orally.

In the meeting of the three students in group 4, make a media game "Snowball Throwing" and make sentences "Asking for opinions, Asking to explain something, and request" and sticking it on the game media.

In the fourth meeting in a group of four, students do a snowball throwing game. In pairs students do question and answer based on commands contained in the game media. Students who ask to measure the duration of their friends talk how many minutes their partners can survive speaking in English with the assessment scores as follows:

Table 3. Assessment Score Duration of Value

| Time | Score |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| 1 minute - 1 minute 29 seconds | 70 |
| 1 minute - 1 minute 59 seconds | 75 |
| 2 minutes - 2 minutes 29 seconds | 80 |
| 2 minutes - 2 minutes 59 seconds | 85 |
| 3 minutes - 3 minutes 29 seconds | 90 |
| 3 minutes - 3 minutes 59 seconds | 95 |
| > 4 minutes | 100 |

To find out the development of students' speaking competencies after being given action in the first cycle, then in the fifth meeting students are given an oral test. Students conduct question and answer directly in pairs based on predetermined themes without playing media. The researcher gives a direct assessment based on the agreed rubric. The aspects assessed are grammar, pronunciation, intonation, fluency and diction (attached rubric).

After the final cycle I test, the researcher analyzes the scores obtained by students. The results of the 1st test show that students who get an average score of more than 80 are 15 people or 62.5%, and those who score less than 80 are 9 people or 37.5%. The average score of the test results is 74.83

The actions taken in the first cycle are carried out based on the Learning Implementation Plan (RPP) made at the planning stage. From the beginning of the implementation of the action there has been an increase in the motivation of students to speak English more actively and they are trying to extend the duration of the talk and further clarify what is described. This is possible because the media of snowball throwing is already well known to students, so it is very interesting to play and what adds motivation to students to be more active in speaking English is a mutually agreed scoring sheet as seen in the table above.

There are several things that note the researcher for improvement in cycle II, namely

There are still many students who have problems in pronouncing certain words in English.

Grammar abilities of students are still lacking. This is apparent when students describe what is being asked by their speaking partners.

When speaking, explaining the question, the speaking partner sometimes suddenly stops or is stuck because of limited mastery of vocabulary and ideas.

Sometimes not understanding what is being asked or explanation of the other person.

5. Sometimes the conversation is not smooth.

The deficiencies were analyzed and became the record of researchers for the implementation of actions in cycle II. As a corrective action to minimize the shortcomings, the researchers discuss and discuss English teacher colleagues

with students. This action is carried out after the implementation of the test at the end of cycle I. After releasing and discussing with the observer the shortcomings and strengths in the action of the first cycle, it is agreed that the study will proceed to cycle II.

CYCLE II

At the 1st meeting of the discussion and discussion about the shortcomings that occurred in the first cycle, including about pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and content. Screened several films through LCD, regarding Introduction material. This is done as a review to correct deficiencies that occur in the first cycle to make it better.

In the second meeting the researcher gives an action in the form of students sitting in pairs. Each pair holds a question on a sheet of paper. Each partner asks each other to answer what questions are there.

In the third meeting students in the group made snowball throwing media and made sentences Asking for opinions, Asking to describe / explain something, and request. The question is written on paper that will be formed into snowball.

In the fourth meeting in a group of four students doing a snowball throwing game. In pairs students do question and answer based on commands contained in the game media. Students who ask to measure the duration of their friends talk how many minutes their partners can survive speaking in English with the assessment scores as follows:

To determine the development of students' speaking competencies after being given action in the second cycle, then in the fifth meeting students were given an oral test. Student do question and answer directly in pairs based on predetermined themes without playing media. The researcher gives a direct assessment based on the agreed rubric. The aspects assessed are grammar, pronunciation, intonation, fluency and diction (attached rubric).

After the final cycle II test, the researcher conducted an analysis of the scores obtained by students (complete test results attached). The results of the second test show students who get an average score of more than 80 are 42 people or 100%. The average score of the test results is 81.88

The actions taken in cycle 2 are carried out based on the Learning Implementation Plan (RPP2) made at the planning stage at the beginning of the cycle 2. The implementation of the action has seen an increase in motivation of students to speak English more actively and they try to extend more clarify the object described . This is possible because the modified media for snake and ladder games has become increasingly well known by students, so it is very interesting to play. Almost all students are more active in speaking English.

There are several things that note the researcher in this second cycle, namely:

Already there are not many students who have problems in pronouncing certain words in English.

Students' grammar abilities have almost no meaningful mistakes. This was evident when they described what was asked by the speech partner.

When talking, explaining the question, the speech partner was barely met, suddenly stopped or stuck because of limited mastery of vocabulary and ideas.

Almost always understand what is being asked or explained by the interlocutor.

Smooth conversation.

After releasing and discussing with the observer the shortcomings and strengths of the cycle actions, it is agreed that the research will be completed. There are several things that note the researcher in this second cycle, namely:

Already there are not many students who have problems in pronouncing certain words in English.

Students' grammar abilities have almost no meaningful mistakes. This was evident when they described what was asked by the speech partner.

When talking, explaining the question, the speech partner was barely met, suddenly stopped or stuck because of limited mastery of vocabulary and ideas.

Almost always understand what is being asked or explained by the interlocutor.

Smooth conversation.

After releasing and discussing with the observer the shortcomings and strengths of the cycle actions, it is agreed that the research will be completed. The analysis we performed on duration, speaking and fluency on the whole silus is shown improvement as in the following graph which is processing data from the recap of values in the attachment.

CONCLUSION

From the results of the process assessment, reflection, and discussion and discussion of the research, it was concluded that snowball throwing can improve speaking skills in English. Introduction material for students of class VII B at SMPN 3 Surabaya. From this study the authors suggest that the Snowball Throwing method is recommended to be used as a learning medium in an effort to improve students' speaking abilities for classes that have similar problems with class VII B students of SMPN 3 Surabaya that we faced during the study.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Teaching of Language and Teaching*. New York. Longman.
- Dirjen Dikdasmen, 2002. *Contextual Teaching and Learning*, Jakarta
- Directorate of Junior High School Development, 2007. *Teachers' Self-Learning Materials of English for Mathematics*, Jakarta
- Dirjen Dikdasmen, 2007. *Curriculum for International Standard Middle School*, English Language Courses, Jakarta
- Dirjen Dikdasmen, 2004. *Material for Integrated Training in English Subjects*, Jakarta
- Euis, Lasmini, 2006. *Classroom Action Research*, Rineka, Bandung
- Kokom, Komalasari, 2005. *Classroom Action Research*, Bandung: Yrama Widya
- Thomas, 1995. *Creative Classroom Activities*, Cambridge Press, Washington

- Lie, Anita, 2002. *Cooperative Learning*, Surabaya, Unesa Press
- Madison Metropolis School Distric, 2004. *Classroom Action Research*, Madison O Malley, J. Michael et al, 1996, *Authentic Assessment*, Virginia
- Susilo, 2007. *Classroom Action Research*, Yogyakarta: PT.Andi Offset
- Gerot, Linda and Wignell Peter, 1995. *Making Sense Of Functional Grammar*, Cambridge Press
- Renandy Willy A, 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching*, Cambridge Press
- Suherman, Erman, 2004, *Classroom Action Research*, Tasikmalaya
- Suyanto, Kasihani, 2002. *Contextual Teaching and Learning Overseas Training and Materials Development*, Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta
- Suyanto, Kasihani, 2003. *Teaching English in Junior High School*, Malang: UM Press
- Suyanto, Kasihani, 2003. *Contextual teaching and Learning in Language Teaching and Learning*, Malang: UM Press
- Silberman, Melvin L, 2006, *Active Learning*, Jakarta: PT. Nusa Media