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Abstract. Learning outcome is the important thing that shows the failure or the success of teaching learning process such as the students seriousness or focus. To achieve learning outcome successfully needs many effort. The effort comes both from teacher and student on how the teacher choose appropriate material, models or methods to class. In choosing them, the teacher should conduct analysis by considering some weaknesses such as students’ lack, time limitation, atmosphere class that mostly bored for students. This research aims to know the effectiveness of “Snowball Throwing” models towards student learning outcomes on functional text at eighth grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan. By using " Quasi Experimental Design with Nonequivalent Control Group Design", which VIII E as experimental class and VIII H as control class, the results showed data obtained from the Independent Sample T Test was significant t_count > t_table or (6.603 > 1.697) that H 1 was accepted and H 0 was rejected whereas this model was effective towards student learning outcomes on the functional text.
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Background
English as the main subject or lesson has been introduced in Indonesian education starting from the elementary school into university level. In learning English, as foreign learner, Indonesian students experience teaching learning process with some difficulties faced in mastery the subject. There are many factors and problems that might come from the students itself, the teacher competence, or it can be from the models of available material. Therefore, English lessons are given no more than two hours a day in twice a week. Time limitation cause the teacher just implement one method such as discussion in delivering material so that the class going to be bored that effect to students’ learning outcomes.

As the statement above, the implementation of English subject needs various models to uncover students’ bored in teaching and learning process, that
is by combining students activeness, media and teacher models. This makes class atmosphere to be more attractive and interesting, because the students are able to understand the theory given and get high score of test and also the student can apply that theory in their daily activity.

So, in this case needs the effective way method or models to make them enjoy while mastering English and to improve student achievement easily, especially in the students’ learning outcomes on functional text. This chosen material is caused by the people that often use this kind of sentence in their conversation such as inviting someone to do something, commanding someone to do something, or forbidding someone to do something.

In the case of junior high school students in Kuningan, there were still found students weaknesses in English teaching learning process, such as the teacher more active than student, students were passive without answering the question of teacher question and teacher still used traditional teaching method. This is why the result of their examination or learning outcomes still need improvement because in understanding the material surely the teacher should rise up students activeness by motivating their learning interest and applying various models. So in this case need the models or method that can help their learning outcome better than before.

Current day, the development of education has been supported by great innovation to rise the quality of students’ learning outcomes. The scientist find out some models to repairs students’ learning outcomes whereas the teachers can use to improve teaching process in the class namely “Snowball Throwing”. It is the one of innovative learning models that can rise up the students’ learning outcomes because this models involve the cooperation between student activity and teacher creativity by the interesting way to carry out the material and more effective. Based on the background of the problem described, the researcher tends to explore the effectiveness of Snowball Throwing models entitled Snowball Throwing Model Towards Students’ Learning Outcomes On Functional Text “Invitation, Command and Prohibition” at The Eight Grade Of SMPN 4 Kuningan.

Formulation Of The Problem
Based on the problem limitation above, this research tends to find out the effectiveness of Snowball Throwing in learning outcomes on functional text “invitation, command, and prohibition” by formulating question as follows: Is Snowball Throwing effective for students’ learning outcomes on functional text “invitation, command, and prohibition” at the eight grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan?

Theoretical Framework
There are two variables that carried out by the reseacher, learning outcomes as the dependent variable and the Snowball Throwing Models as an independent variable. As a learning models snowball throwing can make students better towards english language subjects so that they can also improve student learning outcomes.

According to Asrori (2010),the aims of Snowball Throwing media is exercise students to listen the other opinion, creativity, and imagination on making question and also encourage students to cooperate, help each other, and be active in learning process. Therefore Suprijono, (2010: 8) said Snowball Throwing is the way to serve material or subject where the students formed in some heterogent groups and than in each groups choosed a moderator to get the teachers’ assignment, than the students make some questions on the paper and throw to other group and answer that question by the choosen group.

From the definition above, it can be concluded the students are not just sit and listen the teachers’ explanation passively, because in this models the students encourage to cooperate with their group to show their imagination and creativity and also the students respect the other opinion, this models make the students more active because in the implementation snowball throwing like a game and make the teaching learning process is happier.

In addition, Suri (2017) found in his research that the method Snowball Throwing with visual media class 1b has also increased their learning outcomes, 29 students completed 1 student unfinished, so it can be concluded that the achievement and value of students who have increased, therefore Snowball Throwing method was effective. According to Sakhi (2015), the findings showed that snowball throwing in teaching technique can improve students’ vocabuly mastery. This can be seen from the increase in test result, student vocabulary test in the first cycle was 93,6 and 98% of students had reached the success criteria. Before apply this method only 34% students were able to reach the KKM of 68. Kusumawati (2017) has another conclusion relates to Snowball Throwing models, the conclusion of this research there was effectiveness of cooperative learning model with snowball throwing on learning outcome at grade students of SDN Bondrang Ponorogo 2016/2017. It means that the application of learning models Snowball Throwing can effect learning outcomes at IV grade students of SDN Bondrang Ponorogo, where the result the average value of experimental class was 83.23 and in control group was 71.47.

Based on some previous research, it showed the effectiveness of Snowball Throwing models in students’ learning in each aspects, the Snowball Throwing is effective in teaching learning context.
Research Method

According to Sugiyono, (2017: 6) Educational research methods can be interpreted as a scientific way to obtain valid data with the aim of being able to be found, developed, and proved a certain knowledge so that in turn can be used to understand, solve, and anticipate problems in the field of education. Data collection use research instruments, data analysis is quantitative or statistical because the research data is in the form of numbers with the aim of testing predetermined hypotheses " Sugiyono (2017:14)

This research used a quantitative approach “Quasi Experimental Design with Nonequivalent Control Group Design” with the object being subjected to test as learning outcomes as the dependent variable and the Snowball Throwing Models as an independent variable, with a concentration of research on the effectiveness of Snowball Throwing Models learning media to student learning outcomes. There were experiment class and control class that were chosen regularly, and each sample is being compared. Control group is given a pretest and posttest, and also experiment group have same pretest and posttest as control group. It is expected to be able to measure the improvement of student learning outcomes through the implementation of snowball throwing models on functional text at eight grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan.

Pretest and posttest are used to measure students' cognitive abilities so the research used Quasi Experimental Design with Nonequivalent Control Group Design, can be seen in the following figure:

![Diagram](image_url)
Explanation:
$O_1 =$ experiment class pretest
$O_2 =$ experiment class posttest
$x =$ models
$O_3 =$ control class pretest
$O_4 =$ control class posttest

**Population and Sample**
According to Sugiyono (2015: 117), population is a generalization area consisting of objects or subjects that have certain qualities and characteristics set by researchers to be studied and then conclusions drawn. The population includes all members of the group to be researched. The sample is part of the number and characteristics possessed by the population. The population of this research is at eighth grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan and the sampling technique used by the researcher is simple random sampling, VIII E as experiment class and VIII H as the control class.

**Collecting Data Instrument**
There are available instruments in educational research that are available and have been tested for their validity and reliability, such as instruments for measuring learning outcomes, for measure understanding, measuring IQ and so on. Test instruments to measure learning outcomes of cognitive abilities of students in English subjects focused on functional text material based on indicators achieved.

**Test**
Widoyoko (2014:93) states that the test can be interpreted as a number of questions that must be given a response in order to measure a person's ability level or reveal certain aspects of the person subjected to the test. The test is used to measure learning outcomes, especially aspects of knowledge. Determination of the assessment score refers to the assessment score according to Arifin (2010:128).

\[
\text{Value of each question} = \frac{\text{Score acquisition} \times \text{integrity of questions}}{\text{Maximum score}}
\]

In this research there are two types of tests, these are:

a. Pretest
Pretest is a test performed before students get treatment. The aim is to determine the effect before and after treatment. The test is used to find out the cognitive learning outcomes. The form of the test used is in the form of multiple choice questions.
b. Posttest
Posttest is a test given to students after completion of an experimental program and often used in conjunction with a pretest to measure their achievement and the effectiveness of the models.

c. Documentation
Arikunto (2014: 274) says that documentation is an effort to search data about things or variables in the form of notes, transcripts, books and so on. Photos are kind of documentation in obtaining data.

Finding
Before the research begins, the researcher conducted instrument testing to determine the appropriateness of the instrument to be used. The location of this research is at the eighth-grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan, at VIII E and VIII H classes. The student's amount of each class as follows table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eighth E</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eighth H</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research used experimental method “Quasi Experimental Design with Nonequivalent Control Group Design”. Which use two classes as the experiment class and the control class. This experiment material focused on English subject exactly on functional text and took some sub materials on invitation, command, and prohibition. In the experiment class used Snowball Throwing models as the treatment, while the control class did not use that learning models.

On this research, there were two classes that determined as experiment class and as control class exactly at VIII E and VIII H classes, because in SMPN 4 there were many classes at the eighth grade so the research could not use all of classes to research, so, the researcher used simple random sampling, these choosed classes have almost same characteristics on the age, cognitive level, and same material discussion as the representative sample. The researcher gave pretest and posttest in experiment and control class, which pretest is to know the basic students’ understanding on the certain material before they get the treatment, while posttest is to know the change of students’ understanding and learning outcomes after they get the treatment for experiment class, and for the posttest result of control class to know the differentiation learning outcomes between control class and experiment class.

Analysis
a. Data analysis of experiment and control class

On this research there were experiment class and control class that have different way of treatment. To get the result of data from each class the research used test, and this test used multiple choice test on pretest and posttest. To know clear data it can be seen at the table below:

Table 4.2
List of Pretest and Posttest Control Class Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Students’ Code</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>S-7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>S-8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>S-9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>S-10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>S-11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>S-12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>S-13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>S-14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>S-15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>S-16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>S-17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>S-18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>S-19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>S-21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>S-22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>S-23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>S-25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>S-26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>S-27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>S-28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>S-29</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>S-30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>S-31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>S-32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount 1845 2155
Average 57.66 67.34
Table 4.3

List of Pretest and Posttest Experiment Class Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Students’ Code</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>S-7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>S-8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>S-9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>S-10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>S-11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>S-12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>S-13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>S-14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>S-15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>S-16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>S-17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>S-18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>S-19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>S-20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>S-21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>S-22</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>S-23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>S-24</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>S-25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>S-26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>S-27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>S-28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>S-29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>S-30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>S-31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>S-32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>2730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>59,84</td>
<td>85,31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normality Test
The aims of this test is to know normality of the sample that was taken. To know the normality test from the result of pretest and posttest score in experiment and control class by using specific formulation by One-
sample Shapiro-Wilk. It can be seen the result of this normality test clearly on this following table:

Table 4.4
The Normality Pretest and Posttest Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Signification</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Control Pretest</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Experiment Pretest</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Control Posttest</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Experiment Posttest</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above describe that normality test in experiment and control pretest-posttest, the result of control pretest is 0.286 > 0.05 while the result of experiment pretest is 0.215 > 0.05 ,from the result of pretest means both of classes (experiment and control) from the normal population. And the result of control posttest is 0.132 > 0.05 while the result of experiment posttest is 0.05 > 0.057 it means both of classes (experiment and control) from the normal population. So the conclusion of population and sample that have taken is normal, that can be seen on the result of normality test in experiment and control pretest-posttest by using One-sample Shapiro-Wilk SPSS 25 for windows.

b. Homogenity Test

The aim of homogenity test is to know the variant from the both of classes is same (homogen), the experiment and control data is called homogen which the criteria of homogenity is Signification (sig) Based on Mean > 0.05. The result of this test is shown on the table below:

Table 4.5
The Result of Homogenity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homogenity</th>
<th>Signification</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on Mean</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>Homogen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table of homogenity test above, the signification (sig) Based on Mean is 0.428 > 0.05. From the result of that formulation it can be concluded that experiment and control pretest-posttest from the homogen sample.

c. Hypothesis Test / T-Test

To know the result of hypothesis test the researcher uses independent sample t test this test is statistic analysis to compare two samples that has not relation (Posttest only). Where \( t_{\text{count}} < t_{\text{table}} \) it means \( H_0 \) is accepted and \( H_1 \) is rejected but if \( t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} \) it means \( H_1 \) is accepted and \( H_0 \) is rejected. And this hypothesis test to know that, is there the effect in experiment class
learning outcomes. It can be seen the result of this formulation such as the following table below.

**Table, 4.6**

**The result of t test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>$t_{\text{count}}$</th>
<th>$t_{\text{table}}$</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment and Control</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>$H_1$ Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table show that the calculation of experiment and control posttest by t test which $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}} (6,603 > 1,697)$ it means $H_1$ is accepted and $H_0$ is rejected. So we can catch the meaning from this hypothesis test conclusion that there is effectiveness in experiment class which use snowball throwing models as learning models towards students’ learning outcomes on functional text as the specific material at the eight grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan.

**Discussion**

The objective of this research is to know the effectiveness of snowball throwing models towards students’ learning outcome on functional text, to get the evidence, the researcher conducted research and take population at the eight grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan and two classes as the sample, that is in VIII E class as experiment class and VIII H class as the control class, which the experiment class has given treatment by using snowball throwing models, and also control class has given treatment without using snowball throwing models. According to the result data analysis we can catch the conclusion of this research data as following discussion below:

a. **Learning Outcomes of Experiment Class on Functional Text**

According to the result of data analysis experiment class at eighth E class of SMPN 4 Kuningan in pretest which before the researcher give the treatment get the lower score is 35, and the higher score is 80 then the signification of this score by the result of normality test is $(0,215 > 0,05)$ so this data is normal. While the result of lower posttest score is 65, and the higher score is 100 then the signification by the result of normality test is $0,057$ it means this data is normal.

b. **Learning Outcomes of Control Class on Functional Text**

According to the result of data analysis control class at eighth H class of SMPN 4 Kuningan in pretest which before the researcher give the treatment get the lower score is 35, and the higher score is 75 then the signification of this score by the result of normality test is $(0,286 > 0,05)$ so this data is normal. While the result of lower posttest score is 50, and the higher score is 85 then the signification by the result of normality test is $(0,132 > 0,05)$ it means this data is normal.
c. The Effectiveness Of Snowball Throwing On Students’ Learning Outcomes
The result posttest score of experiment and control class tested by using t test formulation is which $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}}$ or $(6,603 > 1,697)$ it means $H_1$ is accepted and $H_0$ is rejected. So, it showed that the posttest score between control and experiment class is not same and there is differentiation from the average of students’ learning outcomes and there is effectiveness in experiment class which use snowball throwing models as learning models towards students’ learning outcomes on functional text “invitation, command, and prohibition” at the eighth grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan.

The effectiveness snowball throwing models and improvement students’ learning outcomes on experiment class can be caused by the presence of students’ activity, and their good responses from the implementation of snowball throwing models, this can be seen from the one of collecting data technique, that is documentation, and it showed the students’ condition while they are learning, by implementing snowball throwing the students more active and give their good respond, and also they allowed all of rules happily.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS
Based on all of steps in this research starting from the first chapter until this last chapter the answer to know the result of analysis data about the effectiveness snowball throwing towards students’ learning outcome on functional text “invitation, command, and prohibition” at the eighth grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan, so the researcher can take the conclusion that the result of students’ learning outcomes on the implementation the effectiveness snowball throwing on functional text “invitation, command, and prohibition” at the eight grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan, shows that the implementation of snowball throwing is effective towards students’ learning outcomes because there is increasing on students’ learning outcomes who get the treatment by using this models and this result of test can be seen on this formulation. The result posttest score of experiment and control class tested by using t test formulation is which $t_{\text{count}} > t_{\text{table}}$ or $(6,603 > 1,697)$ it means $H_1$ is accepted and $H_0$ is rejected. So it can be concluded that, there is differentiation and improvement of students’ learning outcomes and there is effectiveness in experiment class which use snowball throwing models as learning models towards students’ learning outcomes on functional text “invitation, command, and prohibition” at the eighth grade students of SMPN 4 Kuningan.
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