

IMPROVING THE SKILLS OF STORY THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF THE GROUP INVESTIGATION LEARNING MODEL

Hijrah Baharu

*University Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia
hijrah@unismuh.ac.id*

Received: August 25, 2020 Revised: October 12, 2020 Accepted: October 25, 2020

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to improve storytelling skills through the application of the Group Investigation learning model to VII grade students of Muhammadiyah Limbung Middle School. With a total of 24 students. Data collection techniques used in this study are: (a) students' learning outcomes in English are collected by giving tests at the end of each cycle, (b) data about the teaching and learning process are collected using observation sheets. The data that has been collected is analyzed quantitatively. The results of the analysis showed an increase in quantitative learning outcomes marked by an increase in the average score of students, from 69.16 in the first cycle to 78.12 in the second cycle of an ideal score of 100. Qualitatively, an increase in the quality of the learning process is a change in the attitudes of students marked by: (a) Increasing the frequency of student attendance, (b) The activeness of students in the learning process, (c) The more students pay attention to the teacher's explanation, (d) The more students who ask questions and answer assignments correctly, (e) Increasingly less students who ask for guidance and ask to be explained about a concept.

Keywords: *Speaking, learning model, group investigation, Teaching English*

INTRODUCTION

Efforts to improve the quality and relevance of the world of education in the middle seems to be pursued through curriculum improvement. From the 1976 curriculum it was changed to the 1984 curriculum and the 2004 curriculum and now uses the education unit level curriculum (KTSP) which was implemented in stages starting in the 2006 school year. Although efforts to improve the quality of education have been made, but the problems that exist in the world of education are still complex and complicated (Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A., 2006). The problem is the low quality or quality of education. This happens because of weak school management and the application of methods not in accordance with the characteristics of students.

One of the obstacles faced by Muhammadiyah Limbung Middle School teachers is how to produce effective learning models in learning English (Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A., 2005). In fact the teacher is dealing with subject matter which has a very complex scope because English has several aspects namely writing, reading, listening and speaking (Mary Coonan, C., 2007) (Murphy,

J. M., 1991). This can make it difficult for teachers to structure and systematize subject matter carefully based on the type of content in relation to the learning objectives.

The learning model implemented so far in Muhammadiyah Limbung Middle School uses 80% conventional methods, 10% question and answer and 10% assignments (Reski, A., 2017) (Panis, I. C., & Ki'i, O. A., 2017). The learning method is not effective and the results are not satisfactory because the learning process is centered on the teacher, so the classroom atmosphere and interaction between the teacher and students are less active (Karim, S. T., 2017).

Based on these problems, it is necessary to apply a learning model that is appropriate to the characteristics of students, namely the learning model of the Group investigation (Listiana, L., Susilo, H., Suwono, H., & Suarsini, E., 2016). The group investigation learning model is based on John Dewey's idea of Education (Dolmans, DH, De Grave, W., Wolfhagen, IH, & Van Der Vleuten, CP, 2005), that classes are a mirror of the community and function as a laboratory for learning about life in the real world which aims at studying social and interpersonal problems. Siddiqui, M. H. (2013), Parkay, F. W., Oaks, M. M., & Peters Jr., D. C. (2000) argue that group investigation has been used in various situations and in various fields of study and various age levels. Basically this model is designed to guide students to define problems, explore various horizons about the problem, gather relevant data, develop and test hypotheses.

The aim of this research is to improve speaking skills through the application of the Group investigation learning model to VII grade students of SMP Muhammadiyah Limbung in the academic year 2017/2018.

According to Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015) speaking is the second language activity that humans do in their language life, that is, after listening activities. Based on the sounds that are heard, then humans learn to say and finally skilled at speaking. Speaking is defined as the ability to say articulation sounds or words to express, express and convey thoughts, ideas, and feelings (Xu, L., 2015). It can be said that speaking is a system of audible and visible signs that utilize a number of muscles of the human body for the purpose and goals of the ideas or ideas that are combined. Speaking is a form of human behavior that utilizes physical, psychological, neurological, semantic, and linguistic factors (Li, P., *Volume 9 (2) November 2020, page 195-208*
Copyright ©2020, ISSN: 2252-7818 E-ISSN: 2502-3543

Legault, J., & Litcofsky, K. A., 2014). Based on the opinion above, it can be concluded that speaking is interpreted as a tool to combine ideas that are arranged and developed in accordance with the needs of the listener or listener.

Every speaking activity carried out by humans always has a purpose and purpose. According to Burns, A., & Hill, D. (2013) the main purpose of speaking is to communicate. In order to be able to convey thoughts effectively, then the speaker should understand the meaning of everything he wants to combine, he must be able to evaluate the effects of communication on the listener, and he must know the principles that underlie all the situations of the conversation, both in general and individuals. According to Boxer, D., & Cohen, A. D. (2004) the purpose of the conversation can usually be divided into five groups namely (1) entertaining, (2) informing, (3) stimulating, (4) convincing, and 5) moving.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that a person doing speaking activities in addition to communicating also aims to influence other people with the intention that what is said can be accepted by the interlocutor well. The existence of an active reciprocal relationship in the activities of the speakers between the speaker and the listener will shape communication activities to be more effective and efficient.

In relation to learning language skills, Hasan, S., Rakhman, M., & Ardiana, H. (2011) revealed that Group Investigation learning is based on John Dewey's ideas about education, that class is a mirror of the community and functions as a laboratory for learning about life in the real world which aims to examine social and interpersonal problems Putri, D. (2018) states that type GI or Group Investigation has been used in various situations and in various fields of study and various age levels. Basically this model is designed to guide students to define problems, explore various horizons about the problem, gather relevant data, develop and test hypotheses.

Ministry of National Education (2005: 18) states that In this study the teacher should direct, help students find information, and act as a source of learning, which is able to create a social environment characterized by an environment of democracy and scientific processes.

Supporting facilities used to implement this model are all things that touch the needs of students to be able to explore various information that is appropriate and needed to do the group problem solving process.

Slavin, R. E. (1982) states the stages in implementing the GI learning model are as follows:

a. Grouping Stage Namely

The stage of identifying the topic to be investigated and forming an investigation group, with members of each group of 4 to 5 people. At this stage: 1) students observe sources, choose topics, and determine problem topic categories, 2) students join study groups based on topics they choose or are interesting to investigate, 3) teachers limit the number of members of each group between 4 and 5 people based on skills and heterogeneity.

b. Planning Phase (Planning)

Planning stage or planning stages of learning tasks. At this stage students plan together about: (1) What do they learn? (2) How do they study? (3) Who and what to do? (4) For what purpose are they investigating the topic? For example on the topic of social deviations, at this stage: 1) students learn about forms of social deviance, 2) students learn by digging information, cooperate and discuss, 3) students divide tasks to solve problems on the topic, gather information, conclude the results of investigations and present in class, and (4) students learn to know the beginning of the emergence of social deviations.

c. Phase of Investigation (Investigation)

Investigation Phase, namely the stage of the implementation of student investigation projects. At this stage, students carry out activities as follows: 1) students gather information, analyze data and make conclusions related to the issues investigated, 2) each group member provides input on each group activity, 3) students exchange, discuss clarifying and uniting ideas and opinions. For example: 1) students know the meaning and forms of social deviance, 2) students try ways found from the results of gathering information related to the topic being investigated, and 3) students discuss, clarify each way or step in solving problems about the topic the subject being investigated.

d. Organizing Phase (Organizing)

Namely the preparation stage of the final report. At this stage the students' activities are as follows: 1) group members determine the important messages in their respective protection, 2) group members plan what they will report and how to present it, 3) representatives from each group form a class discussion committee in investigative presentation. For example: 1) students know what social deviance means, 2) students find forms of social deviation, 3) students divide tasks as leaders, moderators, minutes of investigative presentations.

e. Presenting Stage (Presenting)

Presenting stage is the stage of presenting the final report. Learning activities in class at this stage are as follows: (1) group presentation in the whole class in various forms of presentation, (2) groups not as presenters are actively involved as listeners, (3) listeners evaluate, clarify and ask questions or responses to the topics presented. For example: 1) students assigned to represent groups present results or conclusions from investigations that have been carried out, 2) students who are not presenters, ask questions, suggest questions about the topics presented, 3) students record topics presented by presenters.

f. Evaluating stage

At evaluating or evaluating the work process and student project outcomes. At this stage, the teacher or student activities in learning are as follows: 1) students combine input about the topic, the work they have done, and about their effective experiences, 2) the teacher and student collaborate, evaluate about the learning that has been carried out, 3) assessment of learning outcomes must evaluate the level of student understanding. For example: 1) students summarize and record each topic presented, 2) students combine each topic investigated in their group and other groups, 3) the teacher evaluates by giving a description test at the end of the cycle.

Group investigation is a form of cooperative learning model that emphasizes the participation and activities of students to find their own material (information) lessons that will be learned through available materials, for example from textbooks or students can search through the internet (Tirta, GAR, Prabowo, P., & Kuntjoro, S., 2018). Students are involved since planning, both in determining the topic and

the way to learn it through investigation (Chusni, M. M., Mahardika, A., Sayekti, I. C., & Setya, W., 2017). This type requires students to have good abilities in communication and in group process skills. The Group investigation model can train students to develop their ability to think independently. Active student involvement can be seen starting from the first stage to the final stage of learning. In the type of group investigation there are three main concepts, namely: research or inquiry, knowledge or knowledge, and group dynamics or the dynamic of the learning group" (Rana, 2007: 75).

Research here is the process of dynamics students respond to problems and solve these problems. Knowledge is a learning experience gained by students both directly and indirectly. Whereas group dynamics shows an atmosphere that describes a group interacting involving various ideas and opinions and exchanging experiences through mutual argumentation processes.

The investigation group will be used to improve the speaking skills of Grade VII students at the Muhammadiyah Middle School in Limbung. This learning model is considered important because it focuses on students by focusing on student activity in the classroom. Students are emphasized on activeness in the learning process.

RESEARCH METHOD

This activity was a class action research (classroom action research) with stages of implementation that includes, planning, implementing actions, observing and reflecting repeatedly. Khasinah, S. (2013) states that classroom action research is as a form of reflective study by the perpetrators of the actions taken to improve the rational stability of their actions in carrying out the task, deepening the understanding of the actions taken, and improving the conditions under which the learning practices are carried out. This research was conducted at Muhammadiyah Limbung Middle School in the academic year 2017/2018. The subjects of this class action research were Class VII students with 24 students. The focus of this research was; 1) Students, which was to see the activeness and ability of students in solving English problems given as an indicator of learning outcomes. Such as the interests, attention and sincerity of students learning and the courage to ask and respond to answers and other students. 2) The learning process, namely by paying attention to

the techniques used in carrying out learning in the classroom, see the extent of student activity in the learning process and changes in student attitudes in learning English. 3) Results, which investigated were learning outcomes, whether there is an increase or not after the test is held at the end of each cycle.

The procedure of conducting research was carried out in two cycles. Each cycle was carried out in three stages. The stages of conducting research was explained as follows:

First Cycle

This first cycle goes through three stages, namely (a) Action Planning, (b) Implementation of Actions, and (c) Reflection.

Action Planning

At this stage researchers and teachers collaboratively undertake the following activities:

1. Identifying the inhibiting and supporting factors that teachers face in learning English with the group investigation learning model.
2. Formulate alternative learning actions by applying the group investigation learning model as an effort to improve results learn English students.
3. Develop learning tools including syllabus, lesson plans, worksheet material and assessment instrument format.

Action Implementation

At this stage the teacher and researcher carry out 2 actions with the following steps:

1. Researchers carry out learning with a group investigation learning model in teaching in the classroom as the first model, while the teacher as a participant must actively observe and observe or act as an observer involved.
2. The teacher acts as a peer observing the group investigation learning model in teaching English, while the researcher acts as an observer carrying out his task.
3. The researcher conducts a conventional monitoring of the process of implementing the group investigation learning model in improving students' English skills by the researcher. The data is then used as material in carrying out reflection.

Reflection

Reflection is carried out every action ends. In this stage, researchers and teachers hold a discussion of the actions that have just been carried out. This relates to (1) analysis of the actions that have been carried out, (2) discussing further actions in the form of improvements to the weaknesses or weaknesses of the implementation of the actions that have been carried out, (3) intervening, improving, and making conclusions from the data obtained. Then, the results of reflection are used as input to the next action (the second cycle if there is no change).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Result

a. Descriptive Analysis of Final Cycle I Test Results

After the overall implementation of the improvement measures learning cycle I carried out, then the results of the learning outcomes test in the form of providing tests aimed at taking and collecting quantitative data. The descriptive analysis of student acquisition scores after applying the Group Investigation learning model can be seen in table 1 below:

Table 1: Statistics Student Learning Outcomes Score at the End of the Test Implementation of Cycle I

Statistics Value Statistics	Value statistics
Subject	24
Ideal Score	100
Highest Scores	90
Lowest Score	50
Range of Scores	40
Average Score	69,16

Source: Student data analysis result

Table 1 shows that the average score of English learning outcomes for Grade VII students of Muhammadiyah Limbung Middle School after applying the Group Investigation learning model in the first cycle was 69.16 from the ideal score that might have been 100 and was in the medium category. The highest score of 90 and the lowest score obtained is 50. If the score of student learning outcomes is grouped into five standard categories with a classification determined by the Ministry of Education and Culture, the frequency distribution of scores is obtained as shown in table 2 below

Table 2: Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Student Learning Outcome Scores in the Final Test of Acting Cycle I

No	Score	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	0 – 39	Very low	0	0,00
2	40 – 59	Low	6	25
3	60 – 69	Is	5	20,84
4	70 – 89	High	12	50
5	90 - 100	Very High	1	4,16
A m o u n t			24	100

Source: Student data analysis results

Table 2 shows that students' learning outcomes in English are quite varied, in addition it can also be known the completeness of student learning in cycle I. To show students mastery learning the achieved score must meet the minimum completeness criteria of 65. If it is associated with the frequency distribution table and the percentage of results scores learning English in the first cycle then students are said to be complete if included in the high or very high category.

Furthermore, if student learning completeness is based on the minimum completeness criteria (KKM) yaitu 65, then the frequency and percentage of completeness of student learning outcomes can be seen in table 3 below:

Table 3. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Student Mastery Learning in the Implementation of Cycle I Actions

Completeness	Cycle I		Information
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	
Complete	16	66,67	KKM \geq 65
Not complete	8	33,33	
Amount	24	100	

Source: Student data analysis results

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that student learning outcomes in English subjects after applying the Group Investigation learning model in the implementation of the first cycle of action are in the Medium category, from table 4.5 it is concluded that the number of students who completed as many as 16 people or 66, 67%, and the number of students not completing as many as 8 people or 33.33%.

b. Descriptive Analysis of the Final Test Results for Implementing Cycle Actions II

After implementing the second cycle of action, students are given a test of learning outcomes to get quantitative data. Descriptive analysis of student

achievement scores after applying the Group Investigation learning model can be seen in the following table 4:

Table 4. Statistical Score of Student Learning Outcomes on Cycle Test II

Statistics	Statistical value
Subject	24
Ideal Score	100
Highest Scores	95
Lowest Score	65
Range of Scores	30
Average Score	78,12

Source: Student data analysis results

Table 4 shows the average score of English learning outcomes after applying the Group Investigation learning model in cycle II of 78.12 from the ideal score that might be achieved that is 100 and is in the high category. The highest score of 95 and the lowest score obtained is 65. If the score of student learning outcomes is grouped into five standard categories with the classification determined by the Ministry of Education and Culture, the frequency distribution of scores is obtained as shown in Table below:

Table 5. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Student Learning Outcomes Scores in the Implementation of Cycle Actions II

No	Score	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	0 – 39	Very low	0	0,00
2	40 – 59	Low	0	0,00
3	60 – 69	Is	5	0,24
4	70 – 89	High	13	54,16
5	90 – 100	Very High	6	25
A m o u n t			24	100

Source: Student data analysis results

Table 5 shows that student learning outcomes in English are quite varied. The number of students who complete their learning in cycle II is 24 people or 100% of students' learning outcomes are complete because students have met the minimum completeness criteria of 65. Classically the learning outcomes of English in cycle II reach 100% of the number of 24 students. This shows that one of the existing performance indicators has been met, namely the achievement of a minimum grade of 85%.

Furthermore, by using the minimum completeness criteria (KKM), which is ≥ 65 then the student learning completeness can be seen in the following table 6:

Table 6. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Student Mastery Learning in the Implementation of Cycle Actions II

Completeness	Cycle II		Information
	Frequency	Percentage (%)	
Complete	24	100	KKM ≥ 65
Not complete	0	0,00	
A m o u n t	24	100	

Source: Student data analysis results

Based on table 6 and table 7, it can be concluded that student learning outcomes in English subjects after applying the Group Investigation learning model in cycle II has increased compared to cycle I, ie the average score in cycle I increased to 78.12 in cycle II, and the score of student acquisition in cycle II is in the very high category. And from table 7 below, it can be concluded that the number of students who completed was 24 students or 100%.

Improved student learning outcomes in English subjects, after the action is implemented by applying the Group Investigation learning model from cycle I to cycle II can be seen in table 7 below:

Table 7. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Student Learning Outcome Scores in cycle I and cycle II

No	Score	Category	Frequency		Percentage	
			Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle I	Cycle II
1	0 – 39	Very Low	0	0	0,00	0,00
2	40 – 59	Low	6	0	25	0,00
3	60 – 69	Is	5	5	20,84	0,24
4	70 – 89	High	12	13	50	54,16
5	90 - 100	Very High	1	6	4,16	25
A m o u n t			24	24	100	100

Source: Student data analysis results

Table 7 shows that the number of students who completed individually in cycle I was 16 people and increased to 24 people in cycle II. Classically reviewed the increase is 33.33% from 66.67% in the first cycle increased to 100% in the second cycle. This means that one of the existing indicators is fulfilled namely an increase in English learning outcomes through the application of the Group Investigation learning model.

CONCLUSION

Conclusions that can be summarized from the results of classroom action research that has been carried out for two cycles are the results of learning English after being given action through the Group Investigation learning model on English learning in the first cycle it is in the medium category with an average score of 69.16. Whereas in the second cycle are in the high category an average score of 78.12. Thus through the provision of the Group Investigation learning model in Indonesian language learning can improve English learning outcomes of Grade VII students of Muhammadiyah Limbung Middle School.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2006). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. Routledge.
- Boxer, D., & Cohen, A. D. (2004). *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (Vol. 8). Multilingual Matters.
- Burns, A., & Hill, D. (2013). Teaching speaking in a second language. *Applied linguistics and materials development*, 231-248.
- Chusni, M. M., Mahardika, A., Sayekti, I. C., & Setya, W. (2017). The Profile of Student Activities in Learning Basic Natural Science Concepts through The Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) Approach with Group Investigation (GI) Model. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pembelajaran IPA*, 3(1), 1-10.
- Dolmans, D. H., De Grave, W., Wolfhagen, I. H., & Van Der Vleuten, C. P. (2005). Problem-based learning: Future challenges for educational practice and research. *Medical education*, 39(7), 732-741.
- Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs. *Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE (NJI)*.
- Hasan, S., Rakhman, M., & Ardiana, H. (2011). Model Cooperative Learning Tipe Group Investigation untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar pada Mata Pelajaran Perawatan dan Perbaikan Sistem Refrigerasi. *Innovation of Vocational Technology Education*, 7(2).
- Karim, S. T. (2017). *The Effectiveness of TAI (Team Assisted Individualization) to Improve Students' Reading Comprehension at the Second Grade of Senior High School 1 South Polongbnagkeng Takalar* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Makassar).
- Khasinah, S. (2013). Classroom action research. *PIONIR: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 4(1).

- Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural theory and second language development. *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*, 207-226.
- Li, P., Legault, J., & Litcofsky, K. A. (2014). Neuroplasticity as a function of second language learning: anatomical changes in the human brain. *Cortex*, 58, 301-324.
- Listiana, L., Susilo, H., Suwono, H., & Suarsini, E. (2016). Empowering students' metacognitive skills through new teaching strategy (group investigation integrated with think talk write) in biology classroom. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 15(3), 391.
- Mary Coonan, C. (2007). Insider views of the CLIL class through teacher self-observation-introspection. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5), 625-646.
- Murphy, J. M. (1991). Oral communication in TESOL: Integrating speaking, listening, and pronunciation. *Tesol Quarterly*, 25(1), 51-75.
- Panis, I. C., & Ki'i, O. A. (2017, May). The Utilizing Of Phet Simulation As A Computer-Based Learning Media To Improve The Understanding Of College Student's Physics Concepts. In *1st Yogyakarta International Conference on Educational Management/Administration and Pedagogy (YICEMAP 2017)*. Atlantis Press.
- Parkay, F. W., Oaks, M. M., & Peters Jr, D. C. (2000). Promoting group investigation in a graduate-level ITV classroom. *THE Journal (Technological Horizons In Education)*, 27(9), 86.
- Putri, D. (2018). Improving News Writing Skill by Using Cooperative Type Group Investigation Strategy. *Curricula: Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 76-86.
- Reski, A. (2017). *Using Hypnoteaching in Reducing Students' Speaking Anxiety for Eleventh Grade at MA. Muhammadiyah Limbung* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar).
- Siddiqui, M. H. (2013). Group investigation model of teaching: enhancing learning level. *Paripex-Indian Journal of Research*, 3(4).
- Slavin, R. E. (1982). *Cooperative learning: Student teams. What research says to the teacher*. National Education Association Professional Library, PO Box 509, West Haven, CT 06516 (Stock No. 1055-8-00; \$2.00).
- Tirta, G. A. R., Prabowo, P., & Kuntjoro, S. (2018). Development of Physics Teaching Instruments Belong to Cooperative Group Investigation Model to Improve Students' Self-Efficacy and Learning Achievement. *JPPS (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Sains)*, 7(2), 1464-1471.

Xu, L. (2015). Learning to speak in the real-life situations first and written forms afterwards: A proposal based on communicative language teaching for English learning & teaching reform in China. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 5(3), 72.

How to Cite (APA style):

Baharu, Hijrah. (2020, November). Improving The skills of Story Through The application of the group Investigation Learning Model. *Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 9(2), 195-208 Retrieved from <https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/exposure/article/view/4035>