IMPLEMENTATION OF INVESTIGATION GROUP LEARNING MODELS IN IMPROVING THE ABILITY OF WRITING NEGOTIATED TEXT IN VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

Siti Nurjanah[1], Wikanengsih[2]
[1,2]IKIP Siliwangi
[1]enur230172@gmail.com , [2]wikanengs@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Negotiation itself is actually closely related to the daily lives of students. Negotiations are usually carried out by everyone in their daily lives, because negotiating means trying to reach an agreement, in everything. This study implements the investigation group model in the study of negotiating texts. The research objectives are to 1) describe the results of research in the classroom using the investigation group learning model and 2) to describe student learning outcomes. The research method used is an experimental method with a type of non-equivalent control group. The results showed an increase in students with SPSS calculation results was 0.001, meaning that the resulting data was less than 0.05 significance. This means that the instructor writes negotiating texts using the group investigation model is considered successful.

Keywords: *Investigation Group, write negotiating text*

ABSTRAK

Negosiasi biasa dilakukan setiap orang dalam keseharian, karena bernegosiasi berarti berusaha mencapai kesepakatan, dalam segala hal. Penelitian ini mengimplementasikan model grup investigasi pada pembelajaran teks negosiasi. Tujuan penelitian adalah untuk 1) menjabarkan hasil penelitian pada kelas yang menggunakan model pembelajaran grup investigasi dan 2) untuk menjabarkan hasil belajar siswa. Metode penelitian yang digunakan adalah metode eksperimen dengan tipe non-equivalent kontrol grup. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan peningkatan siswa dengan hasil perhitungan SPSS adalah 0,001, artinya data yang dihasilkan kurang dari signifikansi 0,05. Dengan demikian, pembelajaran menulis teks negosiasi menggunakan model grup investigasi dianggap berhasil.

Kata Kunci: *Grup Investigasi*, *menulis teks negosiasi*

INTRODUCTION

The learning process needed by students is learning that is so imprinted on their memories. Not infrequently the learning objectives cannot be achieved, because the process is not fun. Students need approaches and models that are appropriate to the learning material so that learning objectives can be achieved.

The conditions and learning objectives depend on the teacher when choosing a learning model. The model must be following the learning material to be delivered. Besides, the selected learning model should also be able to facilitate student activity both cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. The model is then implemented following what has been stated in the Learning Implementation Plan (RPP) before the process takes place.

To be able to explore the potential of students, teachers must prepare appropriate models when delivering learning material. One model that has been tested by previous researchers is the Investigation Group (GI) model. Shoimin (2014: 80) said that the Investigation Group is a learning model that emphasizes student choice and control rather than applying teaching techniques in the classroom. Anggraini (2010: 42) in his journal said that by applying the group investigation model to the learning process, the students' mathematical problem-solving skills have increased. Fahradina, et al (2014: 60) also argued in his journal about the acquisition of research results that showed increased communication skills and student learning independence by using a group investigative learning model better than conventional learning. Almost in line with this opinion, Listiana (2013: 7) argues about the effectiveness of the investigation group model in empowering students' thinking skills in learning Biology. Of the three opinions based on the results of the study, the Investigation Group is believed to have been effectively implemented in learning.

METHOD

One type of quantitative methods is the quasi-experimental method. This quasi-experiment is used by researchers to describe the results of the study. The quasi-experimental method can be interpreted as a research method used to look for the effect of certain treatments on others under controlled conditions (Sugiyono, 2016: 72). The quasi-experiment used is Quasi-Experimental type nonequivalent control group design, meaning that the two groups namely experiment and control in that type were not randomly selected (Sugiyono, 2016: 79). Therefore, the experimental class is a class that is given research treatment,

while the control class is not given research treatment. The two classes will then be compared to the results of their performance. The experimental class is given a preliminary test (Pretest), as well as a final test (Posttest). The control class was also given a test before learning (Pretest), and after learning (Posttest).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Results

The steps taken according to the investigation group model are dividing students into heterogeneous groups, explaining the purpose of learning and group assignments that must be done, inviting group leaders to find out the task material cooperatively in groups, each group discussing the task material cooperatively in the group, conveying the results of the discussion, the teacher provides a brief explanation (clarification) when a concept error occurs and provides a conclusion, and evaluation (Shoimin, 2014, p. 81). All of these steps have been implemented in research in the experimental class.

Regarding the results obtained by students in the experimental class and the control class, the researcher calculated it with SPSS 21. In the background of the research problem, several research results have been published in several journals regarding the implementation of the investigation group on other learning materials. Anggraini (2010, p. 42) in his journal said that by applying the group investigation model to the learning process, the students' mathematical problem-solving skills have increased. Fahradina, et al (2014, p. 60) also argued in his journal about the acquisition of research results that showed increased communication skills and student learning independence by using a group investigative learning model better than conventional learning. Therefore, the researcher also proved both opinions in the journal by calculating the acquisition of pretest and posttest scores in the experimental and control classes using SPSS 21 calculations. The results of the pretest and posttest in the experimental class were analyzed using SPSS 21 calculations.

Table 1 Data on the Test Results of the Experimental Class and the Control Class

No	Name	Eksperimen		Kontrol	
		Pretest	Postest	Pretest	Postest
1	Siswa 1	54	75	66	70
2	siswa 2	54	70	44	66
3	siswa 3	66	75	70	70
4	siswa 4	66	70	66	70
5	siswa 5	66	75	44	66
6	siswa 6	66	75	70	75
7	siswa 7	66	75	70	75
8	siswa 8	54	70	54	66
9	siswa 9	66	66	70	75
10	siswa 10	70	90	66	70
11	siswa 11	44	70	70	70
12	siswa 12	70	75	54	66
13	siswa 13	66	90	66	70
14	siswa 14	44	66	66	70
15	siswa 15	70	90	66	70
16	siswa 16	70	90	66	70
17	siswa 17	54	75	66	70
18	siswa 18	70	75	54	66
19	siswa 19	66	75	66	75
20	siswa 20	66	75	70	75
21	siswa 21	54	66	44	66
22	siswa 22	66	75	70	75
23	siswa 23	66	75	66	70
24	siswa 24	54	70	66	70
25	siswa 25	66	75	66	70

Obtaining the pretest and posttest values above is then processed by SPSS 21 calculation. First, a descriptive calculation is done from each class. Data on the difference between the experimental and control scores are seen from the highest score, lowest score, mean, median, and standard deviation. Similar to that opinion, the researcher also processes the data which is then tested with a data normality test. The results obtained by calculating the normality test are continued with the mann-whitney test because the significance value is not normally distributed.

Table 2 Analysis of Pretest and Control Class Pretest Results *Descriptive Statistic*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Eksperimen	25	44	70	62,16	8,01914376
Kontrol	25	44	70	63,04	8,60464991
Valid N (listwise)	25				

Based on the data above, there are 25 students in each class. The minimum value in the two classes is the same, which is 44, and the maximum value is also the same, which is 70. However, the average values of the two classes are different. The average experimental class is 62.16, while the control class is 63.04. After the above descriptive, then the normality test is performed.

Table 3 Test of Normality Hasil *Pretest*

Pretes	Kolmogorov-Smirnov(a)			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Eksperimen	0,364	25	0,000	0,778	25	0,000
Kontrol	0,395	25	0,000	0,71	25	0,000

Based on the normality test above, it is known that the number of students in the experimental and control class who took the pretest was 25 people. The sig value obtained by the experimental class and the control class is 0,000, meaning that the data is not normally distributed. Therefore, the Mann Whitney test was carried out.

Table 4 Mann Whitney

	Pretes
Mann-Whitney U	281,5
Wilcoxon W	606,5
Z	-0,64519714
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,518799438

The mann-whitney test above produced a sig (2-tailed) of 0.518, which means the data is normally distributed. If the data is normally distributed, it means that there is no difference in students who are treated at the time of the pretest.

Posttest Analysis Results of Experiment and Control Classes

The first thing done to process the posttest data of the experimental and control class is descriptive statistics.

Table 5 Descriptive Statistic

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Eksperimen	25	66	90	75,32	7,261313
Kontrol	25	66	75	70,24	3,192178
Valid N (listwise)	25				

The number of students who took the posttest in the experimental and control class was 25 people. The minimum value in the two classes is the same, which is 66. However, the maximum value is different, because in the experimental class is 90, while the control class is 75. The average value of the experimental class is 75.32, and the control class 70, 24. From descriptive data then continued with the data normality test.

Table 6 Test of Normality Hasil Posttest

Postest	Kolmogorov-Smirnov(a)			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Eksperimen	0,358	25	0,000	0,775	25	0,000
Kontrol	0,29	25	0,000	0,805	25	0,000

The normality test results above indicate the value of Kolmogorov used because the number of students is less than 33 people. The sig value for both classes is 0,000, which means the two data are not normally distributed. Therefore, the Mann Whitney test was carried out.

Journal of Language Education Research

Table 7 Uji *Mann Whitney*

	Postes
Mann-Whitney U	167,5
Wilcoxon W	492,5
Z	-2,97806
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,002901

The mann whitney test above shows a sig (2-tailed) result of 0.002. The result is <0.005, which means that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. Ho means there are no differences in the results before and after learning. Ha means there are differences in results between before and after learning.

Discussion

The results of writing poetry obtained from the pretest and posttest in the experimental class and the control class are processed by SPSS calculation. The results obtained with the SPSS calculation are through the mann-whitney¸ test because the significance value is not normally distributed. SPSS calculation shows the results of the acquisition value in the experimental class is 90, while the control class is 75. The average value of the experimental class is 75.32, and the control class 70, 24. It can be concluded that the investigation group learning model can improve students' ability to write text in the experimental class.

CONCLUSION

The steps taken according to the investigation group model are dividing students into heterogeneous groups. The results of writing poetry obtained from the pretest and posttest in the experimental class and the control class are processed by SPSS calculation. The results obtained with the SPSS calculation are through the mann-whitney¸ test because the significance value is not normally distributed. SPSS calculation shows the results of the acquisition value in the experimental class is 90, while the control class is 75. The average value of the experimental class is 75.32, and the control class 70, 24. It can be concluded that

the investigation group learning model can improve students' ability to write text in the experimental class.

REFERENCE

Anggraini, L., Siroj, R. A., & Ilma, R. (2010). Penerapan model pembelajaran investigasi kelompok untuk meningkatkan kemampuan pemecahan masalah matematika siswa kelas viii-4 smp negeri 27 palembang. (*Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika*). *4*(1). Hlm 36-43.

Fahradina, N., & Ansari, B. I. (2014). Peningkatan kemampuan komunikasi matematis dan kemandirian belajar siswa smp dengan menggunakan model investigasi kelompok. *Jurnal Didaktik Matematika*, *1*(2). Hlm 51-60.

Listiana, L. (2013). Pemberdayaan keterampilan berpikir dalam pembelajaran biologi melalui model kooperatif tipe gi (group investigation) dan ttw (think, talk, write). (*Proceeding Biology Education Conference: Biology, Science, Enviromental, and Learning).* (Vol. 10, No. 1). Hlm 1-10.

Shoimin, Aris. (2014). *68 Model Pembelajaran Inovatif dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Yogyakarta: AR-RUZZ MEDIA.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R & D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.