

# The Effect of Snowball Throwing in Teaching Vocabulary at MTS Al Falahiyah Lajer Grobogan in the Academic Year 2022/2023

Oktavia Dewi Rismawati<sup>1\*</sup>, Siti Lestari<sup>2</sup>, Rahmawati Sukmaningrum<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Universitas PGRI Semarang, Indonesia

\* oktaviadewirismawati@gmail.com

## Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine and analyze the movement and play behavior of children and adolescents in Penawangan District, Grobogan Regency. This research approach is quantitative research. The type of research used in this study is pseudo-experimental research. The population in this study was all grade VIII students at MTs Al Falahiyah Lajer. The technique used in this study was a saturated sampling technique, so the sample used was as many as 58 respondents. Data collection techniques carried out are pre-test and post-test, documental and questionnaire questionnaires. The Instrument in this study used test instruments, documents, and questionnaires. Data analysis techniques in this study used validity tests, reliability tests, normality tests, homogeneity tests, average similarity tests, paired sample T Test, and Independent Sample T-Test. The study's findings revealed notable variations in students' vocabulary levels before and after being instructed using the snowball-throwing learning method. with a sig value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , or t-count  $22.297 > t\text{-table } 2.04523$ , where the average vocabulary score of students after being taught using the snowball throwing greater than before using the learning paradigm for instruction ( $81.0 > 54.56$ ). In addition, the snowball throwing learning model is more effective in improving the English vocabulary skills of grade VIII Al Falahiyah Lajer students compared to conventional learning where a Tcalculate value of  $5.205 > T\text{table } 2.00404$  and a significance level of  $0.000 < 0.05$  with the average English vocabulary compared to the traditional learning approach, more pupils use the snowball tossing learning methodology. ( $81.0 > 64.55$ ).

**Keywords:** Snowball Throwing In Teaching Vocabulary

## Introduction

The most efficient form of communication is language. We may engage with others, grow as individuals, gain wisdom and insight, and even interact with the outside world through language. We must learn the international language, which is English, in the age of globalization, free trade, and increasingly advanced technical advancements. More than half of the world's population speaks English as an international language, and it plays a crucial role in international relations. (Handayani, 2017).

Mastery of English is very necessary nowadays, not only for adults but also for school students. English at school is studied as a preparation to know more about the outside world. In learning English many aspects need attention, such as mastery of grammar, vocabulary

(*vocabulary*), pronunciation, and so on (Burn, et al, 2015). As one of the main aspects of learning English, mastering vocabulary becomes the basis for being able to master and communicate in English (Alderson & Bachman, 2016).

The problem in this study is stated as follows in light of the context of the problems mentioned above::

1. To what extent is the students' vocabulary skill before they were taught using *snowball throwing* ?
2. To what extent is the students' vocabulary skill after they were taught using *snowball throwing* ?
3. How is the significant difference of student' vocabulary skill before and after they were taught using *snowball throwing* ?

## **Literature Review**

### **The Definition of Vocabulary**

One of the key elements of learning English is developing one's vocabulary. By doing so, one may integrate the four language abilities. People with good mastery will be able to comprehend what is spoken, read, and written. The collection of all the words a person knows or all the words they are likely to use to create new sentences is known as their vocabulary. Sutanto (2010) asserts that vocabulary equals vocabulary.

### **The Definition of Snowball**

There are several definitions according to the Model to several experts, including according Komalasari (2016: 67) states that "Snowball Throwing is a learning model that explores the leadership potential of students in groups and the skills of making-answering questions combined through imaginative games of forming and throwing snowballs".

### **Students In Junior High School Using a Snowball Throwing Model To Learn Vocabulary**

The findings of Gemala Widiyarti's (2016) journal research Application of the Snowball Throwing Model in an Effort to Improve the Speaking Ability of Class VII Students at SMP Al Washliyah 8 Medan is that after the implementation of actions with the Snowball Throwing model, the ability of students in terms of speaking has increased, the increase can be seen from the indicators of product success. When the test was conducted, students' speaking ability and confidence increased gradually from each cycle conducted.. The use of this learning model can help students to dare to express opinions and ideas more fluently and more coherently.

## **Method**

### **Research Design**

Two Group Pretest Posttest is the research methodology employed in this study. which is an experimental design conducted on two different groups that get different exercises. This model is more perfect when compared to the first model, because it uses an initial test (pretest) then after the treatment is given a measurement (posttest) again to determine the effect of the treatment, so that the magnitude of the effect of the experiment can be known with certainty (Arikunto, 2018). The aim is to predict conditions that can be achieved through

actual experiments, but there is no control and/or manipulation of all relevant variables (Ali, 2016).

Tabel 1 : Research Design Two Group pretest-pottest design

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
1	O1	X1	O2
2	O3	X2	O4

### Subject of the Research

This study consisted of two research groups, namely experimental class 1 Using an experimental learning strategy that involves tossing snowballs class 2 learning with make a match learning model. Subject is divided into two classes that are experimental group and controlled group. Experimental group is in class VIII A that get treatment of learning models *snowball throwing*. Controlled grous is in class VIII B that get conventional learning Model treatment. Both groups will take pre-test and post-test.

### Instruments of the Research

The total items of test are 10 in the form of tests with multiple choices. The exam was given before learning activities (pretest) and after learning activities (posttest).

#### 1. Validity Test

Validity is a metric that illustrates the degrees of an instrument's validity. If an instrument can accurately reveal data from the variables being examined and can measure the anticipated outcome, it is considered to be valid. The instrument's high and low levels of validity demonstrate how closely the obtained data adheres to the planned validity (Arikunto, 2010: 35). If the validator has declared that the instrument complies with the established requirements, it is considered to be valid. The Pearson-proposed product-moment correlation formula, also referred to as the correlation formula, can be applied (Arikunto Suharsini).

#### 2. Reliability Test

After the instrument is tested for validity, the valid instrument is then measured for reliability. A trustworthy instrument will yield the same results when used repeatedly to measure the same thing (Sugiyono, 2010: 173). Therefore, consistency or stability of an instrument's data across time is related to reliability. The Alpha approach is employed in this study to assess the consistency of test questions.

#### 3. Normality Test

To ascertain if the data being investigated are regularly distributed or not, the normality test is utilized. When the amount of data above and below the average is equal, as well as the standard deviation, the data is said to be regularly distributed. The normality test in this study use the chi-square or chi-squared formula. Following comparison, the following guidelines are used to make a decision.:

a. Significant level  $\alpha = 5\%$

b.  $X^{\text{count}} \leq X^{\text{Table}}$  Means that the data is normally distributed

By examining the significance level in the SPSS Tests of Normality output table, it is possible to determine if the data distribution is normal or aberrant. If the sig.>0.05 value, then the data is deemed to be normally distributed, according to the decision rule. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test from SPSS 21 for Windows is used for this normality test.

#### 4. Homogeneity Test

The homogeneity test is used to show that two or more groups of sample data come from populations that have the same variation. The homogeneity test was applied to the post-test data from the experimental group and the control group.

5. Equalization Test of means

The experimental class and control class will be checked for the equality of the means following the normality and homogeneity test. To determine whether the samples have the same average or not, the average similarity test uses a two-part test. The SPSS 21 for Windows software is used for the average similarity test, and One-Way Anova is used. The sig. value in the SPSS ANOVA output table indicates whether the acquired data have an equal or unequal average. If the sig value is greater than 0.05, the tested data have the same average, according to the decision rule.

6. Paired Sample T Test

Paired sample t-Test is a test of two paired samples. Paired samples are the same subject, but experience different treatments. This t-test model is used to analyze the research model before and after. According to Widiyanto (2018: 35), paired sample t-test is one of the testing methods used to assess the effectiveness of treatment, characterized by differences in the average before and average after treatment.

7. Independent Sample T-test

The t-test (Independent Sample T-Test) was conducted to determine the difference in students' English vocabulary skills between the control class with the direct learning model and the experimental class with the snowball throwing learning model.

### **Method of Collecting Data**

1. Pre-test

Students that are from experimental and controlled classes are given pre-test before applying English vocabulary learning. It is done on June 6, 2023, the socialization of research as well as giving a pretest to students in class VIII A and VIII B to determine the initial ability of students before being taught English vocabulary learning with *snowball throwing* learning model. The students must answer questions that are given. The form of pre-test is multiple choices.

2. Implementation

After giving pre-test, researcher applies English vocabulary learning with In class VIII A, the snowball-throwing learning paradigm and English vocabulary learning without model for teaching in the classroom with snowballs VIII B on June 6, 2023.

3. Post-test

After applying learning model, students that are from experimental and controlled classes are given post-test. It is done on June 6, 2023 in class VIII A and VIII B. The form of post-test is also multiple choices. The goal of this test is to measure students' vocabulary mastery after being taught English vocabulary learning with *snowball throwing* learning model.

### **Analyzing of Data**

The initial data is pre-test score of two classes before applying English vocabulary learning with *snowball throwing* learning model in class VIII A as experimental class. The data result is post-test score of two classes before applying English vocabulary learning with *snowball throwing* Experimental class VIII A is using a new teaching methodology.If the post-test

score on the students' vocabulary is higher than pre-test score, it means that application of English vocabulary learning through the hurling of snowballs method is effective. To get this, research gives students post-test after they are taught English vocabulary learning with *snowball throwing* learning model. The researcher uses SPSS 21 for Windows program to get result of *One-Way Anova* as average similarity test, Paired sample t-Test is a test of two paired samples and Independent Sample T-test to determine the difference in students' English vocabulary skills between the control class with the direct learning model and the experimental class with the snowball throwing learning model.

## Finding and Discussion

### The Effect Of Snowball Throwing In Teaching Vocabulary

The detailed results of the pretest and posttest of students' vocabulary skills in this experimental group. Furthermore, the results of statistical calculations using the SPSS for windows 21 program for the pretest and posttest of the experimental class can be seen as follows:

Table 2 : Descriptive Statistics of Students' English Vocabulary Ability with Snowball Throwing Learning Model

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Ptetest	30	33	83	54,56	13,349
Posttest	30	63	100	81,00	10,542

The table above indicates that it can be explained that students' vocabulary ability before treatment with the snowball throwing learning model has a minimum value = 33; maximum value = 83; mean = 54.56; standard deviation = 13.349. Students' vocabulary ability after treatment with the snowball throwing learning model has a minimum value = 63; maximum = 100; mean = 81.00; standard deviation = 10.542

To find out the students' response to the snowball throwing learning model, researchers distributed a questionnaire consisting of 10 statements to 30 experimental group students. The results of the student response questionnaire to the snowball throwing learning Learning snowball throwing learning model that has been applied in learning English vocabulary class VIII MTs Al Falahiyah Lajer. Student responses are categorized as follows (Anwar & Yunindra, 2018):

1. Positive: if > 60% of students choose the yes option
2. Negative: if there are  $\geq$  40% of students choosing the option no

Table 3 : Student Response to Snowball Throwing Learning Model

No	Questions	Yes		No		Criteria
		f	%	f	%	
1	I am interested in learning English	25	83,3	5	16,7	Positive
2	This learning model makes me actively learning	24	80	6	20	Positive
3	I can understand the material more easily.	23	76,7	7	23,3	Positive
4	The application of this model can make it easier to remember vocabulary	26	86,7	4	13,3	Positive
5	This learning model makes me more enthusiastic about learning.	24	80	6	20	Positive
6	I feel directly involved in learning.	24	80	6	20	Positive
7	Implementation of learning becomes easier to implement.	24	80	6	20	Positive
8	The learning model makes students	22	73,3	7	26,7	Positive

# The 3<sup>rd</sup> Undergraduate Conference on Applied Linguistics, Linguistics, and Literature (ALLURE)

Vol. 3(1), September, 2023

Online ISSN: 2807-8926

	learn comfortably and happily.					
9	The application of this learning method reduces boredom inside.	25	83,3	5	16,7	Positive
10	My vocabulary ability increased after using this method implemented in class.	25	83,3	5	16,7	Positive
<b>The average</b>		<b>80,66</b>		<b>19,34</b>		<b>Positive</b>

According to the table above, the typical percentage of 10 questions in the student respondent questionnaire is 80.66%, this result indicates that students have a positive.

## A. Students' English Vocabulary with Convention Learning Model

The detailed results of the pretest and posttest of students' vocabulary skills in this control group can be seen in (Appendix 14). Furthermore, the results of statistical calculations using the spss for windows 24 program for the pretest and posttest of the experimental class can be seen as follows:

Table 4 : Descriptive Statistics of Students' English Vocabulary Ability with Direct Learning Model

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	28	33	87	54,54	13,172
Posttest	28	43	93	64,53	13,481

The table above indicates that it can be explained that the initial vocabulary ability of students gets a minimum value = 33; maximum value = 87; mean = 54.54; standard deviation = 13.172. While the vocabulary ability of students with direct learning model has a minimum value = 43; maximum = 93; mean = 64.53; standard deviation = 13.481.

## B. Validity and Reliability Test

Validity Test it is known that from each Question item in the student respondent questionnaire on the learning model, totaling 10 questions tested, all questions are declared valid because they get the  $r_{\text{count}} (0,536 - 0,657) > r_{\text{table}} (0,444)$ .

Table 5 : Validity Test Results of Student English Vocabulary Test Questions

No Soal	R <sub>count</sub>	R <sub>table</sub>	Decision
1	0,634	a. 0,444	Valid
2	0,774	b. 0,444	Valid
3	0,716	c. 0,444	Valid
4	0,686	d. 0,444	Valid
5	0,645	e. 0,444	Valid
6	0,672	f. 0,444	Valid
7	0,682	g. 0,444	Valid
8	0,781	h. 0,444	Valid
9	0,728	i. 0,444	Valid
10	0,802	j. 0,444	Valid

Based on the table above, it is known that from each question item on the students' English vocabulary test questions totaling 10 questions that were tested, all questions were declared valid because they received a value of  $r_{\text{count}} (0,634 - 0,781) > r_{\text{table}} (0,444)$ .

## Reliability Test

To interpret the magnitude of the correlation value is:

Among 0,00 s.d 0,20 : Very low reliability

Among 0,20 s.d 0,40 : Reliability is low

Among 0,40 s.d 0,70 : Medium reliability

Among 0,70 s.d 0,90 : High reliability

Among 0,90 s.d1,00 : Very high reliability

The results of the instrument reliability test in the study can be seen in the following table:

Table 6 : Recapitulation of Instrument Reliability Results

Instrumen	Cronbach's Alpha	Threshold Limit
Student's response to the learning model	0,788	0,60
Students' English Vocabulary Test Questions	0,890	0,60

Based on Table above, it is known that the test of the student response questionnaire instrument to the learning model carried out consists of 10 questions, obtained a *Cronbach alpha* value of  $0.788 > 0.60$ , meaning that the student response questionnaire to the learning model is declared reliable with a high level of reliability.

The instrument test of the student's English vocabulary test consisting of 10 items obtained a *Cronbach alpha* value of  $0.890 > 0.60$ , meaning that the students' English vocabulary test was declared reliable with a very high level of reliability.

### C. Prerequisite Test Analysis

The normality test, homogeneity test, and average equality test are performed before running a different test (paired sample T test and independent sample T test) to ensure that the results are valid.

#### 1. Normality Test

The Shapiro-Wilk observed data normality test was utilized in this study because the sample size for each class was approximately 50 participants. The normality test is used to assess if the samples used in the study are normally distributed or not. In the table below, statistical findings from the SPSS for Windows 21 application are displayed:

Table 7

Results	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Experiment Class Pretest	,089	30	,200	,972	30	,590
Experiment Class Posttest	,092	30	,195	,960	30	,302
Control Class Pretest	,089	28	,200	,970	28	,591
Control Class Posttest	,135	28	,183	,950	28	,197

According to the table above's normality test findings for the students' English vocabulary abilities' pretest and posttest data, the significant value achieved at a significance level of 5% is greater than 0.05. Thus, it may be said that the data in each class comes from a population that is regularly distributed.

#### 2. Homogeneity Test

To determine whether the two classes come from a homogeneous population, the homogeneity test is utilized.

Based on the SPSS output results, it can be deduced that the variance of the data in each class originates from a homogeneous population because the significance value (sig) based on mean is  $0.127 > 0.05$  at the 5% level.

#### 3. Mean Equality Test

To ascertain whether or not the two sample classes deviated from the same average condition, the mean similarity test was performed. The following table shows the outcomes of

the average similarity test analysis in the experimental and control classes using One-Way Anova:

Table 8 : Results of Mean Equality Test

		Total Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	(Combined)	,006	1	,006	,000	,995
Within Groups		9851,918	56	175,927		
Total		9851,924	57			

Based on the average similarity test's findings of students' English vocabulary skills before treatment with different learning models, in the One-Way Anova table above, a significance value of  $0.995 > 0.05$  is obtained, so it can be concluded that the experimental and control classes have the same average value or the initial ability of experimental class students is balanced with the control class.

Thus, after it is known that the initial ability of experimental and control class students is balanced, it can be concluded that both sample classes have met the requirements to be treated, namely providing learning with *snowball throwing* learning models for experimental classes and direct learning models for control groups which are then analyzed to determine the level of difference in the influence of each learning model..

#### D. Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis testing in this study used the paired samples t-test to determine whether the posttest results of students' vocabulary skills were better than the pretest results and the independent samples t-test to determine whether the vocabulary skills of experimental class students were better than the control class or vice versa. This test is used to decide whether the hypothesis is accepted or rejected.

##### 1. Paired Sampel t Test

To find out the average difference before (pretest) and the average English vocabulary ability of students after (posttest) given treatment using the *paired sample T-test* with the help of SPSS for Windows version 21.0, in detail it can be explained as follows:

Table 9 : Paired Sampel T Test

	Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Ptetest - Posttest class Eksperimen	26,448	6,497	1,186	28,874	24,022	22,297	29	,000
Pretest – Posttest class control	9,989	5,301	1,002	12,045	7,934	9,972	27	,000

The Sig value is calculated using the paired samples test table from above.  $0.000 < 0.05$  (2-tailed) or  $t\text{-count } 22,297 > t\text{-table } 2,04523$  The average student's English vocabulary before using the snowball throwing learning model obtained a value of 54.56, and the average student vocabulary after using the snowball throwing learning model obtained a value of 81.0, indicating a significant difference in the students' vocabulary between the two points in time.

##### 2. Independent Samples t Test

To find out which learning model is more effective in improving the English vocabulary skills of grade VIII students between snowball throwing learning model and conventional



learning. To find out this, the analysis used is an *independent sample T test* with the help of SPSS for Windows version 21.0, in detail, it can be explained as follows:

Table 10 : Independent Sampel T Test

		t-test for Equality of Means						
		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Students' English Vocabularies	Equal variances assumed	5,205	56	,000	16,4797	3,1661	10,1372	22,8221
	Equal variances not assumed	5,161	51,112	,000	16,4797	3,1930	10,0698	22,8895

Table 11 : Group Statistics of Snowball Throwing with Direct Learning

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Students' English Vocabularies	Experiment Class Posttest	30	81,005	10,5418	1,9247
	Control Class Posttest	28	64,525	13,4813	2,5477

Based on the table above, the mean value of English vocabulary of students in class VIII MTs Al Falahiyah Lajer with snowball throwing learning model is 81.0 while the mean value of English vocabulary of students with conventional learning model is 64.525. These results show that the average English vocabulary utilizing the snowball-throwing learning methodology is more than those using the traditional learning model. (81.0 > 64.55). effective in improving the English vocabulary of students in class VIII MTs Al Falahiyah Lajer compared to conventional learning.

### E. Students' Vocabulary Before Using Snowball Throwing

Students' vocabulary ability before treatment with the snowball throwing learning model got a minimum value = 33 and; a maximum value = 83 with a mean value = 54.56. These results show that the average student before being taught using snowball throwing has not met the KKM value.

### F. Students' Vocabulary after being taught using Snowball Throwing

Students' vocabulary ability after treatment with the snowball throwing learning model has a minimum value = 63 and maximum value = 100 and an average value of 81.0. These results show that the average student has met the KKM 75.

Based on the student response questionnaire to the learning model, the average percentage of 10 questions in the student respondent questionnaire is 80.66%, this result indicates that students have a positive response to the application of the snowball throwing learning model in learning English vocabulary.

English vocabulary mastery requires communication between teachers and students in its application. Teachers must be creative in creating a good classroom atmosphere so that it can motivate students to learn. Because, the high motivation of students in learning can facilitate learning and by the desired achievements (Zuhafizh et al., 2018). The snowball-throwing

educational model a means of increasing students' mastery of understanding English vocabulary. This learning model requires other people to communicate and the teacher is the director so that the new vocabulary obtained can be directly implemented by students during the learning process. If they are used to it, then the students can use the vocabulary well.

The snowball throwing model that applies question and answer learning can be utilized as a medium for mastering English vocabulary. Because this learning model requires students to know the forms of vocabulary. Students will recognize and will remember the forms of various words so that students' mastery of this vocabulary becomes easier (Karmila, 2022).

### **G. Differences in Students' Vocabulary Before and After Being Taught Using *Snowball Throwing***

A Sig value was produced by the statistical analysis of the matched samples. (2-tailed) The achieved t-count was 22,297, or 0.000 0.05. 2,04523 tables, T Before utilizing the Snowball Throwing learning model, the average student's English vocabulary scored 54.56; after using the model, the average student's vocabulary scored 81.0, suggesting a sizable difference in the students' vocabulary between the two periods in time..

Based on the results of the independent sample t-test, the value is obtained T COUNT Of 5,205 > Ttable 2.00404 and the significance level is 0.000 0.05 to determine which learning model is more effective in improving the English vocabulary skills of VIII grade students compared to the traditional learning paradigm and the snowball-throwing model. These findings demonstrate that there is a difference between the snowball throwing learning model and conventional learning in terms of the English vocabulary of class VIII MTs Al Falahiyah Lajer students. The mean value of the students' English vocabulary with the model of learning via tossing snowballs is 81.0, whereas the mean value of the students' English vocabulary with the conventional learning model is 64.525.

## **Conclusion**

The conclusions drawn from the research findings on "The Effect Of Snowball Throwing In Teaching Vocabulary At Mts Al Falahiyah Lajer In The Academic 2022/2023" that have been previously described including:

1. Prior to employing the snowball-throwing learning methodology, students' vocabulary skills received an average score of 54.56.
2. The average score for students' language skills after employing the Snowball Throwing learning methodology is 81.0.
3. The average vocabulary score of students after using the snowball throwing learning model is higher than before using the learning model (81.0 > 54.56), indicating a statistically significant difference in the students' vocabulary between before and after using the learning model (sig 0.000 0.05, or t-count 22,297 > t-table 2,04523). Additionally, compared to traditional learning where the value is achieved, the snowball tossing learning model is more successful in enhancing the English vocabulary of class VIII Al Falahiyah Lajer children. Students utilizing The Snowball tossing Learning model have an average English vocabulary that is higher than students using the traditional learning model (81.0), according to Tcount derived from 5,205 > Ttable 2.00404 and the significance level of 0.000 0.05.

## **Sugesstion**

Several recommendations are made in light of the conclusions stated above:

1. For Learners  
For students who achieve learning outcomes that fall below KKM, especially in English language acquisition, to raise their learning outcomes by embedding the desired ideals so that a motivation to raise their learning outcomes emerges.
2. For Teachers  
The ability to use this Snowball Throwing learning model, which is more creative and innovative in learning English, may also be for other materials tailored to the material to be delivered in class, in order to capture students' attention, make learning more enjoyable, and prevent students from feeling bored or drained during the course of direct learning activities.
3. For Schools  
We should provide knowledge and training to teachers and students about various cooperative learning models.
4. For Future Research  
The researcher hopes that there will be development in this Snowball Throwing learning model, for example using other factors that can affect students' vocabularies such as internal factors and external factors so that further research will be more complete and relevant.

## **References**

- Sugiyono. 2010. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sudaryono. 2017. *Metodologi Penelitian*. Depok:PT.Raja Grafindo. Husada
- Shoimin, Aris. 2014. *68 Model Pembelajaran Inovatif dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Susanty, Susanty And Fairus Bachmid. 2016. "Perbandingan Metode Ekstraksi Maserasi Dan Refluks Terhadap Kadar Fenolik Dari Ekstrak Tongkol Jagung (*Zea Mays L.*)." *Jurnal Konversi* 5(2):87.
- Sani. Abdullah, 2013. *Inovasi Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Sutanto. 2010. *Perkembangan Kosakata*. Yogyakarta: C.V Andi Offset.
- Suprijono. Agus (2014). *Cooperative Learning: Teori dan Aplikasi PAIKEM*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Siti Nurkhoriyah Pelatun, *Penerapan Motede Snowball Throwing Dalam Peningkatan Keterampilan Berbicara Pada Siswa Kelas III MI Pembengunan UIN Jakarta, Jakarta* 2014, h. 11.
- Triton, Budi Prawira. 2016. *SPSS13.0 Terapan; Riset Statistik Parametrik*. Yogyakarta: C.V Andi Offset.

**The 3<sup>rd</sup> Undergraduate Conference on Applied Linguistics,  
Linguistics, and Literature (ALLURE)**

*Vol. 3(1), September, 2023*

*Online ISSN: 2807-8926*

Utami, Munandar (2020) *Mengembangkan Bakat dan Kreativitas anak sekolah*. PT. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia, Jakarta,

Wakhidin (2016) *Metode pembelajaran interaktif*. Jakarta Rineka Cipta.

Wardani, Satuna Indah, 2015. *Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery Using Word Mapping Strategy*. Okara. Vol.1 Tahun X, Mei 2015.