

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents three topics related to research finding that are the description of data, hypothesis of data, hypothesis testing and discussion.

A. The Description of Data

In this research, the researcher wants to know the Effectiveness of Snowball Throwing Technique to students speaking skill mastery for class VIII at SMPN 5 Tulungagung. The sample of the study consisted of 32 students. The effectiveness can be seen from the significant different score of students speaking ability before and after taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique. The presentation of the data practically answers the research problem stated in Chapter I. The research problem was: is there any significant difference scores on the students' speaking ability before and after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique?

1. Data Presentations of the Students' score before being Taught by Using Snowball Throwing Technique.

The pre-test asked the students to tell a narrative story about Malin Kundang. Each student was given time 5 minutes to tell the narrative story. There were 32 students as the sample of the study. The test was done before treatment process by giving Snowball Throwing Technique in teaching speaking. This test was intended to know the students speaking achievement before the students got treatment. The data of the students'

achievement before being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique could be seen in the following table.

Table 4.1. The students' Score in Pre-Test

NO.	NAME	PRE-TEST X score
1.	AR	55
2.	ANK	56
3.	ATW	55
4.	AA	57
5.	AAP	58
6.	APM	55
7.	AMS	55
8.	BN	55
9.	DAS	60
10.	DRSS	60
11.	D	55
12.	EN	56
13.	EE	56
14.	EAT	60
15.	FYP	65
16.	GPA	62
17.	GAL	62
18.	IFR	65
19.	MDA	68
20.	MF	69
21.	MRB	67
22.	MKU	57
23.	MRA	67
24.	NMKS	67
25.	PM	68
26.	QNAA	69
27.	RAS	68
28.	RS	68
29.	SDPA	69
30.	SDA	68
31.	TFW	67
32.	YMU	68

From the presentation of the results of pre test, the students' score could be categorized into the following table of criteria students' score.

Table 4.2. Table of Criteria Students' Score

No.	Grade	Qualification	Range Score
1.	A	Excellent	80 – 100
2.	B	Very Good	70 – 79
3.	C	Good	60 – 69
4.	D	Need Improvement	1 – 59

The students' score above then were computed by using SPSS. The result was shown in the Table 4.3 below

Tabel 4.3. Descriptive Statistic of Pre-Test

Statistics		
PreTest		
N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		62.09
Median		62.00
Mode		55 ^a
Std. Deviation		5.567

Based on the Table 4.3 the mean score of 32 students were 62.09. According to the table of criteria the mean laid at good qualification. Meanwhile, the median score were 62.00. Finally, the most frequent score were 55 as the mode. The frequency of the students' score were presented in the following table below.

Table 4.4. Frequency of Pre-Test**Nilai_PreTest**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 55	6	18.8	18.8	18.8
56	3	9.4	9.4	28.1
57	2	6.2	6.2	34.4
58	1	3.1	3.1	37.5
60	3	9.4	9.4	46.9
62	2	6.2	6.2	53.1
65	2	6.2	6.2	59.4
67	4	12.5	12.5	71.9
68	6	18.8	18.8	90.6
69	3	9.4	9.4	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

From the Table 4.4, if it was suited with the criteria of students' score, it was found that students who got score 55, 56, 57, 58, their ability of speaking was categorized as need improvement. On the other hand, students who got score 60, 62, 65, 67, 68, 69 were categorized as good.

2. Data Presentations of the Students' Score after being Taught by Using Snowball Throwing Technique

In this research, the researcher presents the results of posttest after the students were taught using Snowball Throwing Technique. The data of students' scores ability in post-test could seen in the following table.

Table 4.5 The Students' Score in Post-Test

NO.	NAME	POST-TEST
1.	AR	65
2.	ANK	64
3.	ATW	68
4.	AA	65
5.	AAP	76
6.	APM	65
7.	AMS	65
8.	BN	65
9.	DAS	77
10.	DRSS	75
11.	D	65
12.	EN	65
13.	EE	64
14.	EAT	68
15.	FYP	68
16.	GPA	70
17.	GAL	65
18.	IFR	80
19.	MDA	80
20.	MF	80
21.	MRB	77
22.	MKU	63
23.	MRA	73
24.	NMKS	71
25.	PM	75
26.	QNAA	77
27.	RAS	80
28.	RS	80
29.	SDPA	78
30.	SDA	80
31.	TFW	79
32.	YMU	76

The students' score above then were computed by using SPSS.

The result was shown in the Table 4.6 below.

Table 4.6. Descriptive Statistic of Post-Test

Statistics		
POST TEST		
N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		71.84
Median		72.00
Mode		65
Std. Deviation		6.345

Based on the Table 4.6, the mean score of 32 students was 71.84. Referring to the table of the criteria of student's score the mean laid at very good qualification. Meanwhile, the median score was 72.00. Finally, the most frequent score was 65 as the mode. The frequency of the students' score were presented in the following table below.

Table 4.7. Frequency of Post-Test**Nilai_PostTest**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 63	1	3.1	3.1	3.1
64	2	6.2	6.2	9.4
65	8	25.0	25.0	34.4
68	3	9.4	9.4	43.8
70	1	3.1	3.1	46.9
71	1	3.1	3.1	50.0
73	1	3.1	3.1	53.1
75	2	6.2	6.2	59.4
76	2	6.2	6.2	65.6
77	3	9.4	9.4	75.0
78	1	3.1	3.1	78.1
79	1	3.1	3.1	81.2
80	6	18.8	18.8	100.0
Total	32	100.0	100.0	

From the table above, if it was suited with the criteria of students; score, it was found that the students who got score 63, 64, 65, 68, their ability of speaking was categorized as good. On the other hand, the students who got score 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79 were categorized as very good. Finally the students who got score 80 were categorized as excellent.

From the descriptions above, there was different score between before and after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique.

The data revealed that the students' scores after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique were better than before of using Snowball Throwing Technique.

To know whether the significant level is bigger or smaller than T-table the researcher analyzed the data by using SPSS statistics 16.0 and result shows in the following table.

Table 4.8 Paired Sample Statistic

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PRE	62.09	32	5.567	.984
	POST	71.84	32	6.345	1.122

Paired Samples Correlations				
		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	PRE & POST	32	.828	.000

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	PRE – POS T	-9.750	3.574	.632	-11.039	-8.461	-15.432	31	.000

After T-test was done by the researcher, the result of t_{count} was (-15.432). The negative which appeared in t_{count} above showed the mean before treatment was lower than after the treatment. Then the researcher gave interpretation to T table (t_0). First the researcher considered the $df = N-1$ with df was 31. At the significance level of 0.05, the score of T-table was 2.037. By comparing the t_{count} and t_0 it was found that t_{count} was bigger than $t_0 = (15.432 > 2.037)$.

Because the t_{count} was bigger than t_0 the alternative hypothesis (H_a) saying that there is significant score before and after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique of the eighth grade students of SMPN 5 Tulungagung is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) saying that there is no significant different score of the students' ability before and after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique of the eighth grade students at SMPN 5 Tulungagung was rejected. It means that there was significant different score before and after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique on students' ability at eighth grade students of SMPN 5 Tulungagung. It could be concluded that the Snowball Throwing Technique was effective used in teaching speaking.

B. Hypothesis Testing

In hypothesis testing, when the significant value (0.000) < significant level (0.05) the alternative (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. While significant value (0.000) > significant level (0.05) the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is rejected.

Based on the statistical calculation using SPSS 16.0, the researcher gives interpretation to significant value. The significant value of the research is 0.000, significance level 0.05 and the T-table 2.037 the df: 31 whereas Tcount 15.432. In conclusion, Tcount is greater than T-table. It means, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. Thus, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) says that snowball throwing technique is accepted and effective for teaching speaking.

C. Discussion

The study is conducted in three steps. The first step is giving pretest to students. Pretest is given to know the students speaking score before being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique. The second step is giving treatment and applying the Snowball Throwing Technique to the students. The treatment is given to the students 3 times. The third step is giving posttest to the students to know the students' speaking score after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique.

From the finding, it is known that T count is bigger than T table (15.432 > 2.037). It shows that there is different speaking score of the eight grade of SMPN 5 Tulungagung before and after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique.

Based on the hypothesis testing alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. Thus, the teaching speaking by using Snowball Throwing Technique gives significant effect on the students' speaking ability. By using Snowball Throwing Technique, the students feel

fun in learning English and make the students more enjoy, confident and interested to speak up. According to Komalasari (2010:67) Snowball Throwing is a learning model to explore the students potential leadership in group and the students' creativity in proposing and answering question which is combined through imaginative game in a group. The students can cooperate with the other students and the learning will enjoyable and the students will not be bored in learning English, especially in practicing speaking skill. By using Snowball Throwing Technique students should confident to speak up.

Meanwhile, According to Nuryati, (2015:2) Snowball Throwing is a technique that requires active students in teaching and learning activities. Snowball Throwing technique as a way in teaching learning speaking in the form question and answers through play and throw snowball in group to other group or in group individually. Each students will get the opportunity to speak up, it practice the students' speaking ability. Moreover, the students practicing speaking as a habit in speaking class. They will not feel shy to speak in front of the other friends. The students are more active in the teaching learning process. The students interact with each other in the same group to acquire and practice the elements of a subject master in order to solve a problem, complete a task or to achieve a goal. By using Snowball Throwing Technique the students are confident to speak up.

During the process of teaching and learning applying Snowball Throwing Technique, the students are confident to speak. Based on the result of the speaking test. The students' score after being taught by using Snowball

Throwing Technique is higher than before being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique. In the pretest, the students score is 62.09 while the students score of posttest is 71.84. Although it shows a slight difference between the two means, the result shows that posttest is better than pretest.

From the result computation, it is concluded that the students get good achievement in master speaking ability after being taught by using Snowball Throwing Technique. Referring to the description above, it can be concluded that in this study, using Snowball Throwing Technique to teach speaking is effective. Practically the theory is accepted and it can improve the students' speaking score at SMPN 5 Tulungagung in the academic year 2015/2016.