

IMPLEMENTATION OF COLLABORATIVE LEARNING MODEL GROUP INVESTIGATION TYPE IN APPRECIATION PROSE FICTION SUBJECT

Fina Hiasa

Universitas Bengkulu
Indonesia
finahiasa@unib.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to determine how the application of the Collaborative Learning Type Group Investigation model can improve the quality of learning in third-semester students of the Indonesian Language Education Study Program, FKIP, Bengkulu University in the fiction prose appreciation course. The descriptive method is used in this research in order to get an overview of the extent to which the quality of learning has increased by using this learning model. This classroom action research was carried out in two cycles using test and non-test techniques at the beginning and end of cycles I and II. The learning outcomes of the first cycle showed that the students who got the A score were 6 people (17%), the B score was 17 people (49%), the C score was 12 people (25%), and the D score was 0 people (0%). While the learning outcomes of the second cycle of students who obtained an A score of 12 people (34%), a B value of 18 people (51%), a C value of 5 people (14%), and a D value of 0 people (0%) These results indicate that the indicators of success the application of the Collaborative Learning Type Group Investigation model of 30% which has not been achieved in cycle I can be achieved in cycle II. In general, it can be concluded that the application of the Collaborative Learning Type Group Investigation model in the Appreciation Prose Fiction course can improve student learning outcomes.

Keywords: Group Investigation, Prose Fiction Appreciation

Introduction

Appreciation of Prose Fiction is a compulsory subject for undergraduate students of the Indonesian Language and Literature Study Program (PBI) FKIP Unib which has a weight of 3 credits. This course is given in odd semesters (III) with learning outcomes, namely students are able to appreciate the works of Indonesian Prose Fiction. Through appreciation activities, one understands, enjoys, and evaluates literary works. Ownership of competencies is characterized by four levels, namely the level of liking, enjoying, reacting, and producing (Wardani.1994 in Sayuti: 15-18).

The focus of this course is how students can appreciate fictional prose works that make students have to read a lot of fictional prose works. It is demanded that students have many references regarding Indonesian prose fiction literature, making

learning lead to the optimization of individual abilities. In addition to producing learning activities that are theoretical and memorizing styles, this method also minimizes student contributions in the classroom. Students seem to tend to be less active in learning activities because teaching and learning activities seem to be in one direction only. Seeing this situation, we need a strategy that reactivates the role of students as active individuals in learning activities. The researcher held a discussion which resulted in a reflection on the need for classroom action research by implementing innovative learning models that could maximize student learning outcomes. The innovative learning model that is expected to improve the quality of Fiction Prose Appreciation lectures into something rational, cognitive, emotional, and affective

for students is the Collaborative Learning Model Group Investigation Type.

The Collaborative Learning Model Group Investigation Type is suitable to be implemented in the Appreciation Prose Fiction course with multi-aspect material. This was confirmed by Slavin (2013: 215-216) who said that the group investigation type collaborative learning model was suitable for integrated study projects related to mastery, analysis, and synthesizing information in connection with efforts to solve multi-faceted problems such as learning prose appreciation.

The steps taken in implementing the Collaborative Learning Model Group Investigation Type are (1) topic selection, (2) collaborative planning, (3) implementation, (4) analysis and synthesis, (5) presentation of final results, and (6) evaluation. . The application of the Collaborative Learning Type Investigation Group model allows students to have active and meaningful involvement in learning activities both individually and in groups so that learning in the Appreciation Fiction Prose course becomes increasingly high quality.

Methodology

This research is a Classroom Action Research. Kunandar (2011) argues that classroom action research is an action research in the scope of education carried out by lecturers, and at the same time as researchers in their class or together with others (collaboration) by designing, implementing, and reflecting on collaborative and participatory actions that aim to improve or improve the quality (quality) of the learning process in its class through a certain action (treatment) in a cycle

This study uses a descriptive method because in this study a description of the extent to which the quality of learning has been improved by using the Collaborative Learning Type Group Investigation model for students who are the research sample. The application of this learning model in the

Appreciation Fiction Prose course allows students to have active and meaningful involvement in learning activities both individually and in groups so that learning in the Appreciation Fiction Prose course becomes increasingly high quality. The class action research plan will be carried out in two cycles, and each cycle consists of four stages, namely (1) planning, (2) acting, (3) observing, and (4) reflection. (reflecting).

The instruments used in this study were the observation sheet and oral test questions to determine the extent of students' understanding of the material provided by using the Collaborative Learning Type Group Investigation model in cycle 1 and cycle 2.

Data analysis techniques used in this study were descriptive statistics, calculating frequency, and percentages presented with tables and graphs. Categories in the data will be adjusted according to existing percentages. Following is the formula that will be used in data processing.

$$X = \frac{\epsilon X}{\epsilon X_{maks}} \times 100\%$$

| | |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| Keterangan | |
| X | = the value sought in percent |
| €X | = Total student grades |
| €Xmaks | = Total score |

Table 1. Kategori Penilaian (Modifikasi Nurgiantoro, 1988:363)

| No | Percentage | Category |
|----|------------|-----------|
| 1 | 80% - 100% | Very good |
| 2 | 70% - 79% | Good |
| 3 | 60% - 69% | Fair |
| 4 | 45% - 59% | Bad |
| 5 | 0% - 44% | Very bad |

Findings and Discussion

Based on the research carried out on 36 PBI students with the aim of improving

the quality of the third semester student learning in the Appreciation Fiction Prose subject with the Collaborative Learning

Type Group Investigation model, the following results were obtained for cycles one and two.

Table Earned Value Cycle Oral Tests I and II

| Rentang Nilai | Huruf | Deskripsi | PEROLEHAN NILAI SIKLUS I | | PEROLEHAN NILAI SIKLUS II | | Target capaian/ketuntasan belajar |
|---------------|-------|-------------|--------------------------|------|---------------------------|------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| 90-100 | A | Sangat baik | 6 | 17% | 12 | 34% | 30% |
| 80-89 | B | baik | 17 | 49% | 18 | 51% | 50% |
| 70-79 | C | Cukup baik | 12 | 34% | 5 | 14% | 20% |
| 0-69 | D | Kurang baik | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Jumlah | | | 35 | 100% | 35 | 100% | 100% |

Table Comparison of Group Observation Results in Cycle I and II

| No | Penilaian per Fase | SIKLUS I | SIKLUS II | Ratio Peningkatan |
|----|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | Persentase hasil observasi | Persentase hasil observasi | |
| 1 | Fase I | 47% | 76% | 29% |
| 2 | Fase II | 51% | 79% | 28% |
| 3 | Fase III | 54% | 85% | 31% |
| 4 | Fase IV | 53% | 80% | 27% |
| 5 | Fase V | 51% | 79% | 28% |

Cycle I

Based on the results of observations in cycle I, it appears that the implementation of the Group Investigation Collaborative Model (KIK) has not yet reached the expected target. In the first cycle of applying the KIK model, researchers still used the conventional method where students were given material to be discussed in groups.

However, the results obtained are still far from the target. This can be seen from the final results per group, namely the first group with a total value of 47 points, the second group with 51 points, group 3 with 54 points, group 4 with 53 points, and group 5 with 51 points which are presented in the table below.

The Result of Assessment of Collaborative Learning Model Type of Investigation Group Sheet for Cycle I

* Adapted from Endah and Eviliyanto (Jurnal Edukasi, Vol. 15, No. 1, Juni 2017)

| No. | Phase | Learning process | Group | Cycle value I |
|-----|--|--|---------|---------------|
| 1. | Phase-1 Determine topics and organize students into groups Maximum value = 5 | 1. The students join their respective groups. 2. The group proposes several topics to be studied? 3. Each group chooses 1 topic according to their wants and interests | Group 1 | 1 |
| | | | Group 2 | 1 |
| | | | Group 3 | 2 |
| | | | Group 4 | 2 |
| | | | Group 5 | 1 |
| 2. | Phase-2 | Students in groups plan together about: | Group 1 | 4 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---------|----|
| | Plan assignments to be studied Maximum value = 10 | (1) what will be studied ?; (2) How to learn it ?; (3) Who did what ?; and (4) For what purpose or interest to investigate the topic that has been determined? | Group 2 | 5 |
| | | | Group 3 | 4 |
| | | | Group 4 | 5 |
| | | | Group 5 | 4 |
| 3. | Phase-3 The group conducts research / investigation Maximum value = 15 | 1. Students and groups investigate the selected topic. 2. Looking for information from various sources. 3. Compare and evaluate the relevance of sources. 4. Explain, expand, and filter knowledge, as well as create information. 5. Formulate answers to questions. | Group 1 | 6 |
| | | | Group 2 | 7 |
| | | | Group 3 | 8 |
| | | | Group 4 | 6 |
| | | | Group 5 | 7 |
| 4. | Phase-4 The group prepares a final report and plans a presentation Maximum value = 20 | 1. Determine the main idea of existing friends. 2. Explain, compare, evaluate findings. 3. Relate findings to common problems. 4. Deciding how to present findings. | Group 1 | 11 |
| | | | Group 2 | 14 |
| | | | Group 3 | 12 |
| | | | Group 4 | 14 |
| | | | Group 5 | 13 |
| 5. | Phase-5 The group makes a presentation Maximum value = 30 | 1. Demonstrate the benefits of knowledge. 2. Evaluate the clarity, attractiveness and relevance of the presentation. 3. Creating a new relationship between the sub-themes. | Group 1 | 15 |
| | | | Group 2 | 15 |
| | | | Group 3 | 16 |
| | | | Group 4 | 15 |
| | | | Group 5 | 16 |
| 6. | Phase-6 Conduct evaluation Maximum value = 20 | 1. Evaluating the idea of research results. 2. Evaluating knowledge. 3. Combine all group findings. 4. Shows achievement as a researcher and as a group member. | Group 1 | 10 |
| | | | Group 2 | 9 |
| | | | Group 3 | 12 |
| | | | Group 4 | 11 |
| | | | Group 5 | 10 |

In addition, researchers also gave oral tests to students at the end of the lesson to find out the extent of students' knowledge after the KIK model was applied. Of the 6 questions asked, only 6 students (17%) got an A because they answered 5 questions correctly. While the rest were 17 students (49%) with a B grade. The value of C is 12 people (34%) and the D value is 0 people (0%). The learning outcomes in cycle I, namely group and individual assessments,

show that the 30% success indicator in implementing KIK has not been achieved, therefore it is necessary to proceed to cycle II.

Cycle II

Based on the results of observations in cycle II, it appears that the implementation of the Group Investigation Collaborative Model (KIK) has reached the expected target. The

first group with a total score of 76 points, the second group with 79 points, group 3 with 85 points, group 4 with 80 points, and

group 5 with 79 points are presented in the table below.

The Result of Assessment of Collaborative Learning Model Type of Investigation Group Sheet for Cycle II

* Adapted from Endah and Eviliyanto (Jurnal Edukasi, Vol. 15, No. 1, Juni 2017)

| No. | Phase | Learning process | Group | Nilai siklus II |
|-----|---|--|---------|-----------------|
| 1. | Phase-1 Determine topics and organize students into groups Maximum value = 5 | 1. The students join their respective groups. 2. The group proposes several topics to be studied? 3. Each group chooses 1 topic according to their wants and interests | Group 1 | 3 |
| | | | Group 2 | 3 |
| | | | Group 3 | 4 |
| | | | Group 4 | 3 |
| | | | Group 5 | 3 |
| 2. | Phase-2 Plan assignments to be studied Maximum value = 10 | Students in groups plan together about: (1) what will be studied ?; (2) How to learn it ?; (3) Who did what ?; and (4) For what purpose or interest to investigate the topic that has been determined? | Group 1 | 6 |
| | | | Group 2 | 7 |
| | | | Group 3 | 6 |
| | | | Group 4 | 7 |
| | | | Group 5 | 7 |
| 3. | Phase-3 The group conducts research / investigation Maximum value = 15 | 1. Students and groups investigate the selected topic. 2. Looking for information from various sources. 3. Compare and evaluate the relevance of sources. 4. Explain, expand, and filter knowledge, as well as create information. 5. Formulate answers to questions. | Group 1 | 10 |
| | | | Group 2 | 11 |
| | | | Group 3 | 13 |
| | | | Group 4 | 12 |
| | | | Group 5 | 10 |
| 4. | Phase-4 The group prepares a final report and plans a presentation Maximum value = 20 | 1. Determine the main idea of existing friends. 2. Explain, compare, evaluate findings. 3. Relate findings to common problems. 4. Deciding how to present findings. | Group 1 | 15 |
| | | | Group 2 | 17 |
| | | | Group 3 | 16 |
| | | | Group 4 | 14 |
| | | | Group 5 | 15 |
| 5. | Phase-5 The group makes a presentation Maximum value = 30 | 1. Demonstrate the benefits of knowledge. 2. Evaluate the clarity, attractiveness and relevance of the presentation. | Group 1 | 25 |
| | | | Group 2 | 26 |
| | | | Group 3 | 28 |
| | | | Group 4 | 28 |
| | | | Group 5 | 26 |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|---------|----|
| | | 3. Creating a new relationship between the sub-themes. | | |
| 6. | Phase-6 Conduct evaluation Maximum value = 20 | 1. Evaluating the idea of research results. 2. Evaluating knowledge. 3. Combine all group findings. 4. Shows achievement as a researcher and as a group member. | Group 1 | 17 |
| | | | Group 2 | 15 |
| | | | Group 3 | 18 |
| | | | Group 4 | 16 |
| | | | Group 5 | 18 |

In the first cycle of applying the KIK model, researchers still used the conventional method where students were given material to be discussed in groups. However, in cycle II students were not only in groups, but were also given the task of making material that had been investigated in the form of 3-dimensional wall paper which would be presented in front of the class. In addition, the researcher also gave oral tests to students at the end of the lesson to find out the extent of students' knowledge about character material with the application of the KIK model. This has an impact on learning outcomes that increase compared to cycle I.

3D wall magazine made by students shows the creativity side of students. Students are required to work in groups by first investigating the material given. By maximizing the power of imagination and creativity combined with his understanding of the material of the story characters, learning outcomes will also increase. The learning results in the first cycle showed that students who obtained an A score were 12 people (34%), 18 students (51%) had B grades, 5 C scores (14%) and 0 D scores (0%). These results show that 30% of the indicators of success in implementing KIK have been achieved.

The implementation of KIK in cycle I showed quite good results even though it had not yet reached the predetermined percentage of success indicators. Students are enthusiastic in implementing KIK because they find and explore learning material by themselves in groups. However, the euphoria in exploring the material

independently does not coincide with responsibility for completing tasks. Most groups tend to get involved in investigating material without focusing on the end goal. Students tend to run out of time so that even group assignments cannot be completed properly. This is different from individual assignments where students answer oral questions given. The learning results in cycle I showed that there were 6 students (17%) who scored A, 17 people (49%) had B grades, 12 students (25%) had C scores, and 0 D scores (0%).

The results in cycle I show that the indicators of success in implementing KIK as much as 30% have not been achieved, therefore it is necessary to proceed to cycle II. The implementation of KIK in cycle II showed satisfactory results because it reached and even exceeded the predetermined percentage of success indicators. Students become more enthusiastic in applying KIK to story character material by presenting the results of investigating character material through 3-dimensional wall paper. In cycle II, not only cognitive abilities are required but also creativity. There is a group that has good results in transforming the results of investigations into the material of the story characters into 3-dimensional wall magazine and is also good at answering oral test questions about the proposed story characters

Conclusion

From the results of the research that has been done, it can be concluded as follows;
 a) The application of the Group

Investigation Type Collaborative learning model (KIK) for the Fiction Prose Appreciation course for PBI Unib semester III students of class B of the 2018/2019 academic year can improve student learning outcomes. Completeness of learning can be obtained in cycle II of the two planned cycles, b) This increase in learning outcomes shows that the group investigation model is considered a direct and effective way of teaching science academically and is able to touch social processes and aspects

References

- Aunurrahman. 2009. Belajar dan Pembelajaran. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Joyce, B., Marsha, W., & Emily, C. 2009. Models of Teaching: Model-Model Pengajaran. Pustaka Pelajar: Yogyakarta.
- Santyasa, I Wayan. 2006. “Pembelajaran Inovatif: Collaborative Model, Project-Based, dan Orientasi NOS”. Disajikan dalam Seminar di Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA) Negeri 2 Semarang”. Tanggal 27 Desember.
- Sayuti, A. Suminto. 1994. Apresiasi Prosa Fiksi. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Slavin, Robert E. 2011. Cooperative Learning: Teori, Riset, dan Praktik. Terjemahan Narulita Yusron. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- Setiawan. 2006. “Kelebihan & Kekurangan Pembelajaran Group Investigation” (online), [http://discussion-lecture.blogspot.com/2006/09/kelebihan](http://discussion-lecture.blogspot.com/2006/09/kelebihan-dankekurangan-pembelajaran-group-investigaton.html) dan <http://discussion-lecture.blogspot.com/2006/09/kekurangan-pembelajaran-group-investigaton.html> (diakses tanggal 02 Mei 2018 jam 14.35 WIB)