

Snowball Throwing Type Of Cooperative Learning Model To Improve Student's Learning Achievement

Ellis Susmawati¹, Mochamad Muchson²

¹*Sekolah Menengah Pertama Negeri I Semen Kabupaten Kediri*

²*Economic Education Departement, Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri*

Corresponding Author: Mochamad Muchson

Submitted: 01-11-2021

Revised: 06-11-2021

Accepted: 09-11-2021

ABSTRACT: Student achievement is influenced by many factors, both internal and external factors. From the many factors that affect student achievement is the teacher's teaching method. The teacher's teaching method is still dominant with teacher centered like teacher-centered learning activities where the teacher is the only information on the subject matter. This situation causes students to be bored and less enthusiastic in understanding the subject matter, especially followed by the lack of learning media. As a result, student learning achievement is not optimal. For this reason, more creative teachers are needed; teacher should use various models and teaching methods. The objective is to involve students in the learning process more actively and learning to be fun. The purpose of learning is not only students to memorize the subject matter but also to form student competencies through main competencies and basic competencies so that they can be used as necessities for future life. The purpose of the study was to apply a snowball throwing type of cooperative learning model to improve student achievement in social studies subjects at SMPN I Semen, Kediri Regency.

This research approach was quantitative with descriptive research methods. Research method hoped to describe in-depth analysis of the object of research. The population of this study was all students of class VII B with a total of 31 students with saturated sampling which the entire population became a member of the sample. Instruments and data collection techniques used was tests. The data analysis technique used was descriptive statistics.

The results showed from the results of individual post-tests to assess student success after the

implementation of the snowball throwing type of cooperative learning model, 31 students whose scores were above the KKM were 28 and whose below the KKM were 3 students. Students who score above the KKM are planned to receive enrichment materials and students who score below the KKM are planned to receive remedial materials. The cooperative learning model can improve learning achievement because: 1) Positive interdependence: positive interdependence means that group members realize that they need to work together to achieve goals. 2) Face to face interaction: all members interact directly face to face. 3) Individual accountability: each member must learn and contribute for the work and success of the group. 4) Use of collaborative/social skills: skills to work together and socialize are needed, for this; teachers' guidance is needed so that students can collaborate. 5) Group processing: students need to assess how they work effectively. Snowball throwing can improve learning achievement because: 1) it can increase student learning activity. 2) It can develop the intellectual, social, and emotional potential that exists in students. 3) It can train students to express ideas and feelings.

Key words: Learning Model, Cooperatif learning, Snowball Throwing, Learning Achievement

I. INTRODUCTION

SMPN I Semen is one of the schools in the western part of Kediri Regency which is nearby to the Kediri City area. Students come from villages around Wilis mountain in the east with the main jobs of their parents are farmers, farm laborers, small traders, construction workers and only a small part from civil servants, TNI/Polri or big entrepreneurs. Conditions like this cause the

average student are categorized into lower-middle economy class; means that they are less supportive of the learning facilities, both in terms of learning resources or home situations where parents are less concerned about their children's learning progress because they are busy with work.

Student achievement is influenced by many factors, both internal and external students. From the internal side like students' learning motivation, parents' economic conditions related to parental attention and the completeness of student learning resources, etc. the external side that affects learning achievement like school infrastructure such as laboratories, school libraries, school Wi-Fi, LCD; teacher teaching methods, school academic culture, participating in tutoring outside of school, etc (Hamalik, 2012)

One of the many factors that affect student achievement is the teacher's teaching method. The teacher's teaching method is still dominant with teacher centered. In teacher-centered learning activities, the teacher is the only source of information on the subject matter. Usually teachers use the lecture method with very little involvement of students in learning activities. The learning process in the class is dominant with students listening to the teacher lecture, being asked questions, being given homework. This situation causes students to be bored and less enthusiastic in understanding the subject matter, especially with the lack of learning media. As a result, student learning achievement is not optimal.

As a result, more creative teachers are needed, teachers who are able to teach using various models and teaching methods. The objective is to involve students in the learning process more actively and learning becomes fun activity. The learning objectives are not only for students to memorize the subject matter but to form student competencies through main competencies and basic competencies so that they can be used as necessities for life in the future (Asrori, 2010).

There are many learning models that can be applied by teachers like cooperative learning, problem base learning, contextual teaching and learning, quantum learning, PAIKEM, thematic learning models. This study applies a cooperative learning model with type snowball throwing in social studies subjects. Cooperative learning is a group learning model where collaboration between students is the center of student activities. Students study in a group and work together to complete assignments. This learning model is more effective than students learning alone. The weakness of this learning model is the limited knowledge of students, limited learning resources and no room

for exchanging ideas. While the benefits of cooperative learning is that students can give and receive both knowledge, learning resources, ideas and students will get the results of the collaboration process (Isjoni, 2007)

Snowball throwing is a group learning model where students in one class are divided into several groups; each group member is given a worksheet to be given the task of compiling questions from the group leader's information. The worksheet is then rolled up and thrown (throwing) to friends freely like a snowball then each group discusses to answer any questions they can. After being given sufficient time to discuss, each group presented the results of their discussion (Safitri, 2012). The assessment is in the form of group assessment; it is how many groups are able to correctly answer all the questions received by their group members. Awards are given to groups (Hardiyanti, 2012).

This study is conducted to apply a snowball throwing type of cooperative learning model to improve student achievement in social studies subjects at SMPN I Semen, Kediri Regency.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This study used a quantitative research approach with descriptive research methods. It was a research method that described an in-depth analysis of the research object. The research population was all students of class VII H with a total of 31 students. The sampling technique was saturated sampling which mean that the entire population was a member of the sample. Instruments and data collection techniques used was tests. The data analysis technique used was descriptive statistics as following: $\text{Score} = \frac{\text{Score of acquisition}}{\text{maximum score}} \times 100$ (Muchson, 2015).

III. RESEARCH FINDING

This research starts from the preparation of learning instruments consisting of a Lesson Plan (RPP) and its attachments such as learning materials, basic materials, remedial materials and enrichment materials, learning media and learning evaluations. In preparing the lesson plans, a learning model instruments consisting of syntax and materials such as paper was also prepared to be used for the implementation of snowball throwing.

After the learning preparation was complete, the teacher conducted learning by following the RPP that has been prepared. According to the observations of the researcher as well as the teacher, in the implementation of learning ran smoothly and there were no obstacles,

which means that the syntax ran smoothly and students could follow the snowball throwing learning model well.

The following is presented data on the results of the evaluation of learning after the implementation of the cooperative learning model of snowball throwing type.

1. List the questions for each group member after getting a roll of paper from a friend.
2. List of group discussion scores
3. List of group presentation scores
4. List of post test scores

Table 3.1: List of questions for each group member after getting a roll of paper from a friend

No	Names	Questions
1	Ainun Sintia Dewi	Low-fat milk, vitamin C and exercise are used to meet the needs of . . .
2	Ahmed Agis Mido	Community needs and individual needs is a classification of needs according to . . .
3	Christoper Gusde Pratama	based on the time of fulfillment, needs can be classified into . . .
4	Citra Kurniant	Give an example of each based on the needs classified according to the subject!
5	Delvino Ardi Lesmana	Human needs related to mental and moral and intellectual conditions are . . .
6	Dewi Eka Agustina	According to the time, saving, joining insurance, and pension funds are needs of . . .
7	Dinar Agustina	Classification of individual and collective needs is a needs based on . . .
8	Donny Tata Aditya	According to the classification, physical needs is . . .
9	Dwi Prasetyo Nugroho	Needs that must be met immediately and should not be delayed, including the needs of..
10	Emma Jaya Mustika Ningrum	What needsis the followings? A housewife always set aside the remaining money for savings.
11	Firman Ferdiansyah	Based on its nature, eating is a needs of . . .
12	Gita Hartanto	According to the classification, individual and group needs including needs of. . .
13	Irma Adelia	As humans, the most important basic needs are called. .
14	Lailatul Faizah Zunaina	Viewing from the nature, learning, recreation, and watching TV are needs of . . .
15	Maisa Sidik Manunggal	When viewed from the level of importance, housing is a needs of . . .
16	Marliya Wulandari	Explain the meaning of needs!
17	Mohamad Ari Wibowo Rahmadani	Mention and explain primary needs!
18	Mohamad Eka Hardiansah	knowledge based on their nature are including needs of . . .
19	Mohamad Weny Setiafani	Needs that must be met immediately after basic needs are called . . .
20	Muhammad Robet Nugroho	Needs which the fulfillment can still be postponed in the future are called needs of . . .
21	Novi Dwi Agustina	The need for the fulfillment of individual needs is called . . .
22	Nur Mega Ramadhani	Mention and explain the needs according to the time of fulfillment!
23	Oktavian Saputra	Computers, tractors, machines, photocopiers according to their function are . . .
24	Rara Devita Sari	A situation which the available resources are felt to

		be insufficient/inadequate to meet various needs is called . . .
25	Riadi Septiono Bagus Saputro	Explain the definition of secondary needs!
26	Rino Tito Wibisono	Luxurious needs is called needs of . . .
27	Rismadani	All the needs to meet in order of human survival to not disturbed is called . . .
28	Senia Gabriela	Which is an example of a secondary need?
29	Tivara Herliana Sholihah	Food is one of the primary needs because . . .
30	Vina Dwi Jayanti	The existence of buses, libraries and mosques is a fulfillment of needs of . . .
31	Yona Rima Apriliya	The need to have friend, to be loved, to love, to be respected, experience progress are called needs of . . .

Each student in the group was able to make questions well after being explained by the group leader. The group leader was explained the subject matter from the teacher. After each group member made question then those questions were thrown freely to his friends (snowball throwing). His friends who got thrown questions then

answered that were discussed in groups. Teacher assessment was a group assessment because the learning model was cooperative learning. The group with the highest score received a reward. Below is a table of lists the group discussion scores.

Table 3.2: list of group discussion scores

Group 1

No.	Students' Name	Ability to work in group (1-4)	Ability to create a list of questions (1-4)	Ability to answer the questions (1-4)	Maintain the situation of discussion (1-4)	Score	Total Score
1.	Ainun Sintia Dewi	3	3	3	3	12	75
2.	Ahmed Agis Mido	3	3	3	3	12	75
3.	Christoper Gusde Pratama	4	3	3	3	13	81
4	Citra Kurniant	4	4	3	4	15	94
5	Delvino Ardi Lesmana	4	4	3	3	14	86
6	Dewi Eka Agustina	3	4	3	4	14	86
7	Dinar Agustina	3	3	3	4	13	81
8	Donny Tata Aditya	2	3	3	3	11	69
	Rata-rata						80,87

Group 2

No	Students' Name	Ability to work in group (1-4)	Ability to create a list of questions (1-4)	Ability to answer the questions (1-4)	Maintain the situation of discussion (1-4)	Score	Total Score
1.	Dwi Prasetyo Nugroho	3	3	3	3	12	75
2.	Emma Jaya Mustika Ningrum	4	4	3	4	15	94
3.	Firman Ferdiansyah	4	3	3	4	14	86
4.	Gita Hartanto	3	3	3	2	15	94
5.	Irma Adelia	4	3	3	4	14	86
6.	Lailatul Faizah Zunaina	3	4	3	4	14	86
7.	Maisa Sidik Manunggal	3	3	3	4	13	82
8.	Marliya Wulandari	3	3	3	3	12	75
	Rata-rata						84,75

Group 3

No	Students' Name	Ability to work in group (1-4)	Ability to create a list of questions (1-4)	Ability to answer the questions (1-4)	Maintain the situation of discussion (1-4)	Score	Total Score
1.	Mohamad Ari Wibowo Rahmadani	3	2	3	3	11	69
2.	Mohamad Eka Hardiansah	3	2	3	3	11	69
3.	Mohamad Weny Setiafani	4	3	3	4	14	86
4.	Muhammad Robet Nugroho	3	3	3	3	12	75
5.	Novi Dwi Agustina	4	3	4	4	15	94
6.	Nur Mega Ramadhani	4	4	3	4	15	94
7.	Oktavian Saputra	3	3	3	4	13	82
8.	Rara Devita Sari	4	4	3	4	15	94
	Rata-rata						82,87

Group 4

No	Students' Name	Ability to work in group (1-4)	Ability to create a list of questions (1-4)	Ability to answer the questions (1-4)	Maintain the situation of discussion (1-4)	Score	Total Score
1.	Riadi Septiono Bagus Saputro	4	3	3	4	14	86
2.	Rino Tito Wibisono	3	3	3	3	12	75
3.	Rismadani	4	3	3	4	14	86
4	Senia Gabriela	4	3	3	4	14	86
5	Tivara Herliana Sholihah	4	3	4	4	15	94
6	Vina Dwi Jayanti	4	4	3	4	15	94
7	Yona Rima Apriliya	3	4	4	3	15	94
	Rata-rata						87,85

The score of group discussion shows:

1. Group 1 the average score was 80.87
2. Group 2 the average score was 84.75
3. Group 3 the average score was 82.87
4. Group 4 the average score was 87.85

As a result, the highest score in group 4 gets a reward or award from the teacher. The average group scores above the KKM 70, this shows that the snowball throwing type of learning model is able to improve student learning activities.

Table 3.3: List of group presentation scores

Group 1

No	Scored Aspects	Score				
		0	1	2	3	4
1.	Presentation				v	
2.	Argument				v	
3.	Answer the question				v	
4.	Material Understanding				v	
Total Score		12				
Maximum Score		16				
Score		75				

Group 2

No	Scored Aspects	Score				
		0	1	2	3	4
1.	Presentation				v	
2.	Argument				v	
3.	Answer the question				v	
4.	Material Understanding					v
Total Score		13				
Maximum Score		16				

Score	81,25
-------	-------

Group 3

No	Scored Aspects	Score				
		0	1	2	3	4
1.	Presentation					v
2.	Argument				v	
3.	Answer the question				v	
4.	Material Understanding				v	
Total Score		13				
Maximum Score		16				
Score		81,25				

Group 4

No	Scored Aspects	Score				
		0	1	2	3	4
1.	Presentation				v	
2.	Argument					v
3.	Answer the question					v
4.	Material Understanding				v	
Total Score		14				
Maximum Score		16				
Score		87,5				

The score of the group presentation shows:

1. Group 1 score was 75
2. Group 2 score was 81.25
3. Group 3 score was 81.25
4. Group 4 score was 87.5

As a result, the highest score in group presentation was group 4 which got a reward or award from the teacher. Each group got a score above the KKM or 70, this shows that the cooperative learning model is able to improve student learning activities.

Table 3.4: List of post-test scores

No	Students' Name	Score
1	Ainun Sintia Dewi	70
2	Ahmed Agis Mido	70
3	Christoper Gusde Pratama	80
4	Citra Kurniant	90
5	Delvino Ardi Lesmana	80
6	Dewi Eka Agustina	80
7	Dinar Agustina	80
8	Donny Tata Aditya	60
9	Dwi Prasetyo Nugroho	70
10	Emma Jaya Mustika Ningrum	90
11	Firman Ferdiansyah	80
12	Gita Hartanto	80
13	Irma Adelia	80
14	Lailatul Faizah Zunaina	80
15	Maisa Sidik Manunggal	80
16	Marliya Wulandari	70
17	Mohamad Ari Wibowo Rahmadani	60
18	Mohamad Eka Hardiansah	60
19	Mohamad Weny Setiafani	80
20	Muhammad Robet Nugroho	70

21	Novi Dwi Agustina	100
22	Nur Mega Ramadhani	100
23	Oktavian Saputra	80
24	Rara Devita Sari	100
25	Riadi Septiono Bagus Saputro	80
26	Rino Tito Wibisono	70
27	Rismadani	90
28	Senia Gabriela	80
29	Tivara Herliana Sholihah	100
30	Vina Dwi Jayanti	100
31	Yona Rima Apriliya	90

Minimum Completeness Criteria (KKM) = 70

From the results of individual post tests to assess student success after the implementation of the snowball throwing type of cooperative learning model, 31 students whose scores were above the KKM were 28 and those below the KKM were 3 students as the followings:

1. Donny Tata Aditya score was 60
2. M. Ari Wibowo R score was 60
3. M. Eka Hardiansah score was 60

Students who score above the KKM will be given enrichment materials and students who scored below the KKM will be given remedial materials.

IV. DISCUSSION

The cooperative learning model can improve learning achievement because (Isjoni, 2007):

1. **Positive interdependence:** positive interdependence means that group members realize that they need to work together to achieve goals.
2. **Face to face interaction:** all members interact by facing each other.
3. **Individual accountability:** each member must learn and contribute for the work and success of the group.
4. **Use of collaborative/social skills:** skills to work together and socialize are needed, for this, teacher guidance is needed so that students can collaborate.
5. **Group processing:** students need to assess how they work effectively.

The Snowball Throwing learning model can improve learning achievement because (Asrori, 2010:3):

1. It can improve student learning activities.
2. It can develop the intellectual, social, and emotional potential that exists in students.
3. It can train students to express ideas and feelings.

V. CONCLUSION

1. Each student in the group was able to make questions well and was able to make answers that were discussed in the group well.
2. The highest score gained by group 4 who received a reward or award from the teacher. The average group scores was above the KKM (70), this shows that the snowball throwing type of learning model was able to improve student learning activities.
3. The highest score in group presentation was gained by group 4 which got a reward or award from the teacher. Each group got a score above the KKM (70), this shows the cooperative learning model was able to improve student learning activities.
4. Individual post test was used to assess student success after the implementation of the snowball throwing type cooperative learning model. From 31 students, who scored above the KKM were 28 and those below the KKM were 3 students.

VI. SUGGESTION

1. Well time management is needed to apply the Snowball Throwing type cooperative learning model because the lesson hours are only 2 hours.
2. Well class management is needed to apply the Snowball Throwing cooperative learning model because the number of students is 31.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Asrori. 2010. Penggunaan Model Belajar Snowball Throwing dalam Meningkatkan Keaktifan Belajar.[The use of Snowball Throwing Learning Model In Improving Learning Activity]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- [2]. Hardiyanti.2012. Efektifitas Model Pembelajaran Snowbal Throwing.[The Effectiveness of the Snowball Throwing Learning Model]. Yogyakarta: Cipta Remaja

- [3]. Hamalik, Umar. 2012, Pengantar Interaksi Belajar Mengajar Dasar. [Introduction to Basic Teaching and Learning Interaction]. Bandung. Tarsito.
- [4]. Isjoni. 2007. Cooperative Learning Efektifitas Pembelajaran Kelompok. [Cooperative Learning Group Learning Effectiveness]. Pekan Baru : Alfabeta
- [5]. Muchson, Muchamad. 2015. Statistik Deskriptif. [Descriptive Statistic]. Bogor. Gue Pedia
- [6]. Safitri, Dian. 2011. Metode Pembelajaran Snowball hrowing. [Snowball Throwing Learning Method]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar