The Implementation of Group Investigation to Improve the Students' Speaking Skill

Iswardati
SMU 2 Samarinda, Indonesia
isdarwati@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research aimed to find out how group investigation improves the student's speaking skill of the second grade students of SMA 2 Samarinda, how group investigation improves the student's participation in speaking of second grade students of SMA 2 Samarinda, and what the obstacles are in the implementation of Group Investigation. The classroom action research was employed in this study and was done in two cycles. Each cycle consisted of four stages: (1) planning, (2) action, (3) observation, and (4) reflection. Each cycle took three meetings. The instruments used to collect the data were observation, checklist, field-note, and speaking test. After the implementation of Group Investigation through two cycles, the researcher concluded: *First*, Group Investigation improves the students' speaking ability by (a) increasing the students' pronunciation, grammatical, vocabulary, and fluency, (b) by reducing the students' reluctance to speak, worry of making mistakes, and afraid of being laughed at by other students. *Second*, Group Investigation improves the students' participation in speaking (a) the students learnt how to investigate a certain problem and to solve the problem using English, (b) how to share, (c) how to discuss, (d) how to give their ideas, (e) how to accept other opinions, and (f) how to present their ideas. *Third*, the obstacles in the implementation of Group Investigation are: (a) The students were noisy, (b) Some students spent too short in the presentation, (c) Some students had difficulties in expressing their arguments and suggestion related to the topics, and (d) Few students dominated the group investigation.

Keywords: group investigation, speaking

A. Introduction

Mastering the communicative competence in using English is important, so that the Indonesian government adds the teaching of English from junior high schools, particularly for senior high schools, in fostering the students able to communicate both in oral and in written forms to overcome their daily problems (Depdiknas, 2006). Thus, the teaching of English is to develop the four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Speaking, as one of the four skills, should be developed to develop the students' ability communiating in English. According to Hedge (2003), learning speaking is very important for students. Speaking is an activity to understand and gain information in verbal communication. Speaking is also the activity of expressing ideas and thoughts through verbal language. The ability to understand what other people talk and to answer in the target language is the indication of mastery the language. The ability of speaking will maintain their involvement in the real communication of English and express ideas and thought.

In learning a second or foreign language, one is considered have mastered the language when s/he is able to use it in term of speaking. Nunan (1999) states that the ability to function in another language is generally characterized in terms of being able to speak that language. People measure the mastery of a language by seeing whether one can speak the language or not. The teaching of speaking should enable the students to use the language orally in the real communication. Harmer (2001) argues that teachers should foster their students by giving speaking tasks that provoke them to use all and any language at their command. Those tasks are leading the students to have a change in using English in or outside the class, to give confidence, and to motivate the students.

In fact, not all students are able to speak English. Many students are low in speaking ability. Nunan (1999) states that many English learners are reluctant and unmotivated. The reluctance may be due to cultural factors, linguistics factors, and/or psychological/affective factors. Cultural factors derive from learners' experiences and the expectations created by these experiences. Meanwhile, Gebhard (2000) states that one of the problems faced by EFL learners is *the students' won't talk* problem. Some students will not talk because they are too shy or have such high levels of anxiety over speaking. Perhaps, they are shy because they are afraid of making mistakes or their friends will laugh at them. They are also anxious because they had not many changes to speak.

Based on my experience in SMA 2 Samarinda, the researcher found many problems related to speaking. Most of the students were less motivated in speaking task. Some of the students really want to express their ideas and feelings but they do not know how to express their ideas. Some of the students know how to construct sentences but they are reluctant to speak. They are afraid of making mistakes. They are also afraid of being laughed at by other students, so they just keep silent and keep their ideas and feelings in their mind.

Nunan (1999) gives some suggestions to overcome the problems as the following: (1) for reluctant students, engage in a certain amount of learner training to encourage them to participate in speaking, and (2) for unmotivated students, link learners to the need and interests of the learners, allow them to bring their own

knowledge and perspectives into the learning process, encourage creative language use, and develop ways in which learners can record their own progress. In addition, Gebhard (2000) says that get students to talk, (1) the students must know that we do not expect them to speak perfect English, and (2) teachers need to provide opportunities for students to feel at ease in the classroom. Harmer also suggests that teaching speaking should motivate students and give them confidence (Harmer, 2001b).

Considering the facts above, there would be a need to implement a proper strategy in order to make my students speak. There are many alternatives strategies to improve the student's ability in speaking. One of the strategies that a teacher could use is group investigation. Slavin (2008) states that group investigation is related to the activities of collecting, analyzing, and synthesizing information in order to solving a multi-task problem. The students can look for any information from the inside or outside the classroom, such as: books, institution, or society.

Group investigation has several advantages. First, it can improve students' academic achievement. Slavin (2008) reveals that cooperative learning techniques including group investigation is helpful to achieve personal learning goal by achieving group learning goal. If a member of a group wants to achieve his/her goal, she/he must help achieving the group goal. By doing together to get the group goal, the students can apply an appropriate way to get the success in learning. In cooperative learning classroom, the higher students help the lower achievers. Second, it motivates students to learn. Students' learning motivation plays an important role in determining the success of their academic performances.

Group investigation is effective to use in teaching speaking; the application of group investigation in speaking is very good for the students, so that students become active and freely to speak up in learning speaking (Mufidah, 2015), the result shows that there are some improvements on the students' speaking skill quantitatively and qualitatively (Argawati, 2014), and learning model group investigation has been carried out properly and vocational students have better learning achievement since investigation group learning model can improve learning achievement of vocational school students (sangadji, 2016).

Group investigation can motivate students since the technique has the sense of competition and fun for students. Besides, students will be motivated because they are helped by their teammates. Being motivated, students will participate actively during the lesson. The implementation of group investigation can increase students' participation in the lesson. Third, it decreases the clever students' dominance from the low achievers. Since all students, including the shy or weak ones, should participate in reporting the answer. It encourages peer tutoring from clever students who know the answer to other team members who do not. The teachers can maximize their learning when they give the students the role of tutor, so that they may participate in both explaining and answering in the lesson. Forth, it can promote the students' awareness in to get the learning goal from the first place; planning (Sharan & Sharan, 1989) In group investigation, the students take an active part in planning what they will study and how. They form cooperative groups according to common interest in a topic. Fifth, it can develop students' critical thinking. Harris and Hanley in Cohen (2004) states the overall goal of group investigation is to develop higher-level critical thinking skills.

Based on the benefits of group investigation, the researcher is interested in implementing the technique in her class. She wants to know the implementation of group investigation to solve teaching speaking problems of the students SMA 2 Samarinda. By conducting the classroom action research in improving the students' speaking ability through group investigation, the researcher expects that the speaking problems faced by the students of SMA 2 Samarinda can be solved.

B. Literature Review

Group investigation model is related to the activities of collecting, analyzing, and synthesizing information in order to solving a multi-task problem. The students can look for any information from the inside or outside the classroom, such as: books, institution, or society (Slavin, 2008).

Rolheiser & Anderson (in Cohen, 2004) states that the focus of the group investigations has varied from teacher experiences with educational change, to school-wide approaches to curriculum (literacy, math, etc.), and to exploration of the policies, practices, and theories associated with contemporary education issues (e.g., school violence, antiracism, parent involvement, bullying, special education, computers in schools). We require students to reflect on their experience as learners in a group investigation and to discuss applications of group investigation.

In addition, Brody and Nagel (in Cohen, 2004) claims that the teacher might conduct group investigations on a contemporary issue, or organize small group discussions. Foreign language interns need to understand the relationship between student-talk and both informal and formal structured tasks for practicing and expanding specific aspects of language learning. The science coordinator expects interns to learn how to conduct laboratories and to construct experiences that rely on both collaborative and cooperative learning approaches. Science interns focus on the value of complex tasks for student-directed inquiry and conceptual understanding.

According to Slavin (2008) in implementing group investigation can be done in six steps. Those steps are: 1) identifying the topic and organizing pupils into groups, 2) planning the learning task, 3) carrying out the investigation, 4) preparing a final report, 5) presenting the final report, and 6) evaluation. Figuring out the steps, the implementation of group investigation technique started from identifying topics that can really influence the further steps.

As stated in the background of the study in previous section, there are a number of advantages of group investigation technique. First, it can improve students' academic achievement. Slavin (2008) reveals that cooperative learning techniques including group investigation is helpful to achieve personal learning goal by achieving group learning goal. If a member of a group wants to achieve his/her goal, she/he must help achieving the group goal. By doing together to get the group goal, the students can apply an appropriate way to get the success in learning. In cooperative learning classroom, the higher students help the lower achievers. Second, it motivates students to learn. Students' learning motivation plays an important role in determining the success of their academic performances. Group investigation can motivate students since the technique has the sense of competition and fun for students. Besides, students will be motivated because they are helped by their teammates. Being motivated, students will participate actively during the lesson. The implementation of group investigation can

increase students' participation in the lesson. Third, it decreases the clever students' dominance from the low achievers. Since all students, including the shy or weak ones, should participate in reporting the answer. It encourages peer tutoring from clever students who know the answer to other team members who do not. The teachers can maximize their learning when they give the students the role of tutor, so that they may participate in both explaining and answering in the lesson. Forth, it can promote the students' awareness in to get the learning goal from the first place; planning. Sharan & Sharan (1989) states that in group investigation, the students take an active part in planning what they will study and how. They form cooperative groups according to common interest in a topic. Fifth, it can develop students' critical thinking. Harris and Hanley (in Cohen, 2004) states the overall goal of group investigation is to develop higher-level critical thinking skills. The strategy divides the students in the class into groups, uses multifaceted learning tasks, and includes multilateral communication among the students.

C. Research Methodology

This research belongs to classroom action research since it focuses on a particular problem faced by the teacher when practices in a certain classroom. McNiff (1988) states that action research encourages a teacher to be reflective of his own practice in order to enhance the quality of education for himself and his pupils. Car and Kemmis says (in McNiff, 1988) that action research in the education field is a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social (including educational) situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of: 1) their own social educational practices, 2) their understanding of these practices, and 3) the situations in which the practices are carried out. From those statements, we know that classroom action research has a goal to improve the quality of teaching and learning both for the students' achievement and the quality of the teaching and learning process.

Action research is done by the teachers themselves; it is not imposed on them by someone else. According to Kemmis and Carr 1986 cited by McNiff (1988), action research is a form of self-reflective enquiry undertaken by teachers or principals in educational situation in order to improve the quality of their own educational practices and their understanding of these practices. The classroom action research in this study is done following Kemmis' cycle process (McNiff, 1988). Each cycle covers four steps; planning, implementing, Observing, and Reflecting.

The study was conducted at SMA 2 Samarinda. It was chosen as the setting of the study for the reason that it is where the researcher teaches and she intends to apply the strategy in improving the students' speaking ability. The subjects of the study are the second grade students. The total number of the students in the second grade is 34 students. The second grade students are selected because the researcher finds the problems in speaking in that class.

The data required in this research deals with the action of teaching and learning process and the students' activities so that, the data collection technique were done in two ways; qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative data deals with teaching and learning process which consists of teaching in meeting 1, 2, 3, and 4 of each cycle. The data were collected by using observation sheet and field-note. Quantitative data deals with

the students speaking achievement which is obtained by administering a speaking test after each four meetings.

Qualitative data collection technique is conducted by collaborator. The collaborator used teacher's observation sheet in group investigation to record the data by putting the following mark on teaching component: (yes) for conducted component and (no) for not conducted component. The researcher used the students' observation sheet (*see appendix*) to check the students' instructional activities and to record the data by putting the checklist on group investigation component: sharing, discussing, clarifying, and synthesizing.

Quantitative data is collected by administering the speaking test. The data is collected by using a speaking score sheet (*see appendix*) to record the data by putting scores on speaking aspect, such as: grammar, pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and content. The score uses the ranges from 1 to 5 in which 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, and 5=excellent.

Field-note was used by the researcher to get more detail information on teacher and students' performance during teaching and learning process. Field-note was used to note the data that are not covered by observation form, such as: whether the activities match the time allotment and strengths and flaws of teaching and learning done by using group investigation.

To analyze the process, an observation checklist was used. For teacher, the aspects that was observed are the teacher' activity included in three phases of speaking teaching and learning activity by using (yes) for conducted component and (no) for not conducted component. For students, the researcher was the students' observation sheet to check the students' activities and to record the data by putting the tick ($\sqrt{}$) on group investigation component: sharing, discussing, clarifying, and synthesizing.

Moreover, to analyze the students' test result, students' speaking test was used to find whether there is an improvement or a change. First, the students' speaking skill was scored, and it was done by administering the speaking test. The researcher scored the speaking skill including: grammar, pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and content. The score uses the ranges from 1 to 5 in which 1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, and 5=excellent.

The results of the analysis then was compared the criteria of success defined in this study as a reference to the reflection. It was done with the purpose of measuring whether those defined criteria of success have been achieved or not, and therefore, the decision of carrying out the next cycle can be made.

D. Research Findings

There are two kinds of the findings of this research, finding in cycle 1 and finding in cycle 2. The explanation is given below.

1. Research Finding in Cycle 1

This research was conducted to improve the speaking ability of second grade students of SMA 2 Samarinda. The success of the research was based on the results of the data analysis on the students' speaking achievement and the students' participation in the teaching-learning process to the implementation of the group investigation that it should fulfilled the 2 criteria of success.

Cycle 1 had four meetings. Meeting 1 up to Meeting 3 was the implementation of group investigation in the teaching of speaking in the second grade students of SMA 2 Samarinda. Here, the researcher taught speaking assisted by an English teacher of SMA 2 Samarinda which was positioned as a collaborator. Meeting 4 was the administration of speaking test for cycle 1. Both the researcher and the collaborator scored the students speaking skill using the score sheet instruments based on the speaking score rubric.

The teaching of speaking using group investigation in Meeting 1 up to Meeting 3 was done in three stages; pre teaching, whilst teaching, and post teaching. In pre teaching stage, the researcher warmed the speaking class by making conversation with some students for about 10 minutes and explained how to use the students' knowledge in doing group investigation. In whilst teaching, the researcher taught the students speaking by using group investigation. Here, the researcher implemented group investigation in the teaching of speaking by using some steps, they are: identifying the topic and organizing pupils into groups, planning the learning task, carrying out the investigation, promoting in reporting the group investigation, presenting the final report of group investigation, and doing Evaluation. In post teaching, the researcher provided feedback/reinforcement in the form of oral and written, confirmed the results of exploration and elaboration through motivational explanation, and facilitated the students to reflect on learning experience.

In the first meeting of cycle 1, the researcher found that in the beginning the students couldn't understand the teacher's instruction, but later the students understand it. It was understandable because group investigation is a new uncommon learning model for them. Some students have a difficulty to understand group investigation and how to make group investigation. They were not familiar with this teaching model. Only few students involved in group investigation activities. There was no group made a report and made a presentation as the result of group investigation. The researcher also found that the male students played much.

In the second meeting of cycle 1, the researcher found that the students understood the teacher's instructions, but they sometimes got difficulty to do group investigation. There's one group that cannot give the argument and the suggestion of the topic given. Four groups only gave the arguments and there's no suggestion of the topics investigated. Only one group was really active in doing group investigation activities. They did investigation by collecting information, analyzing data, and concluding the findings. This group also made a report and presented the result of group investigation. It seems that the low achiever students or students who have not enough self-confident did not give much contribution to the topic investigated. Many students were reluctant to express their ideas in English in their group.

In the third meeting of cycle 1, the researcher found that not all students do investigation, especially students in group 5. They seemed difficult to find the appropriate words and construct English sentences. Two groups only gave the arguments and there's no suggestion of the topics investigated. When a group made a presentation, others were noisy. The students did no pay attention to the group that presented the result of group investigation. The class was noisy. Noise was permissive as long as they did group investigation. There were many mistakes in grammar and pronunciation. Some students were lack of vocabulary. Some of them got difficulty in

forming sentences. Some students were lack of fluency, they sometimes were difficult to expressing their ideas. There were also some students who were dominating the activities.

In Cycle 1, the researcher found that group investigation is a new unfamiliar teaching and learning speaking model to the students. The above explanation shows that some obstacles were found in the implementation of it and the criteria of success could not be reached yet. In general it was fine. They learnt something there; they learnt how to share, to discuss, to give their ideas, and to present their ideas. It was an important step to improve their speaking ability.

Based on the implementation of group investigation in Cycle 1, the researcher made a reflection. It was done to improve the implementation of group investigation for further cycle. Some improvements were made in the form of:

a) Motivate the students to speak English.

b) Motivate the students not to be shy in learning speaking.

c) Manage the time.

d) Simplify the instruction.

e) Teach how to make a simple presentation.

f) Teach how to make suggestion based on the argument.

g) Supply with appropriate vocabulary for the topic of group investigation.

h) Use a brainstorming.

i) Prepare a media/picture.

The implementation of this classroom action research was based on the teaching of speaking problems faced by the students of SMA 2 Samarinda. The problems identified were most of the students were less motivated in speaking task, some of the students really wanted to express their ideas and feelings but they did not know how to express their ideas, some of the students knew how to construct sentences but they were reluctant to speak, they were afraid of making mistakes, and they were also afraid of being laughed at by other students, so they just kept silent and kept their ideas and feelings in their mind. By implementing group investigation, it was expected those problems would be solved.

To know the result of the implementation of group investigation, the researcher conducted speaking test in the end of cycle 1. The steps of speaking test were: asking 3-4 students came forward, giving a picture to be described, the pictures were: things, animal, human, class, canteen etc, presenting the test, and scoring the students' speaking proficiency based on scoring guide adapted and modified from Tunku Mohtar (2005).

The data on the students' speaking achievement were obtained from the students' performance in speaking. The data, then, were analyzed by using analytic scoring rubric, they are grammar, pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and content. The scales of score were Excellent (5 marks), Very good (4 marks), Good (3 marks), Fair (2 marks), and Poor (1 marks).

It was found that the average score of delivery aspects from Rater 1 (researcher) was 2.86, and Rater 2 (collaborator) was 2.92, meanwhile the average score was 2.89.

There was only a slight different among the two scores, showing that the consistency of the scores was good. Based on the rating employed by the researcher and the collaborator in assessing the students' speaking performance, it was revealed that the students' average score was 2.89. In this area of score, the ability was qualified as 'Fair'.

The students' performance showed that the improvement of students' average score in Cycle 1 was higher than the average score in the preliminary study. It revealed that the average preliminary study score was 2.71 and the average score of the students in Cycle 1 was 2.89. It means that there was an improvement of the students' speaking ability. However, not all students' scores improved. There were six students whose scores were same like the preliminary study score. They were afraid of being laughed at by other students, so they just kept silent and kept their ideas and feelings in their mind. The crieria of success has not been reached yet.

In getting the data on the students' participation in the teaching-learning process, the researcher utilized observation sheet of student's participation. The observation sheet consisted of 4 indicators (sharing, discussing, clarifying, and synthesizing) to see the students' involvement during the implementation of the group investigation.

Based on the data obtained from the observation sheet of students' participation, no student performed all the 4 indicators (sharing, discussing, clarifying, and synthesizing) of doing group investigation in Cycle 1 Meeting 1, then three students did all the 4 indicators in Meeting 2, and four students did all the 4 indicators in Meeting 3. In group investigation, the students have to share, discuss, clarify, and synthesize the information. Mostly all the students can do sharing and discussing, but very few students could do clarifying and synthesizing.

The findings also showed that there was a huge improvement on the students' participation in the speaking class by using group investigation. In meeting 1, 48% of the students were actively involved in the teaching and learning process, whereas in meeting 3, it was 63 % of the students. It means that the improvement of the students' involvement from meeting 1 to meeting 3 was 31.25%.

To sum up, the result of the data analysis indicated that the students' participation or involvement in teaching-learning process –63%– was not success. Actually, it was a huge improvement, but it was not huge enough to reach the criterion of success that was 70%.

2. Research Findings in Cycle 2

Like in Cycle 1, Cycle 2 also had four meetings. Meeting 1 up to Meeting 3 was the implementation of group investigation in the teaching of speaking in the second grade students of SMA 2 Samarinda. Meeting 4 is the administration of speaking test for cycle 2. Both the researcher and the collaborator scored the students speaking skill using the score sheet instruments based on the speaking score rubric.

The criteria success was not fulfilled in cycle 1, some improvement of the implementation of Group Investigation (GI) were made in the form of:

a) Motivate the students to speak English.
b) Motivate the students not to be shy in learning speaking.
c) Manage the time.

d) Simplify the instruction.

e) Teach how to make a simple presentation.

f) Teach how to make suggestion based on the argument.

g) Supply with appropriate vocabulary for the topic of group investigation.

h) Use a brainstorming.

i) Prepare a media/picture

The implementation of group investigation in Cycle 2 Meeting 1 up to Meeting 3 was done in three stages; pre teaching, whilst teaching, and post teaching. In pre teaching stage, the researcher made simple conversation, did brainstorming, and explained how to use the students' knowledge in doing group investigation. In whilst teaching, the researcher taught the students speaking by using group investigation. The researcher implemented group investigation using some steps, they are: identifying the topic and organizing pupils into groups, planning the learning task, carrying out the investigation, promoting in reporting the group investigation, presenting the final report of group investigation, and doing Evaluation. In post teaching, the researcher provided feedback/reinforcement, confirmed the results of exploration and elaboration through motivational explanation, and facilitated the students doing reflection.

In the first meeting of cycle 2, the researcher played a game as brainstorming. In this meeting, she found that most of the students were active in doing group investigation. The students did group investigation by using the pictures and media given. The students were noisy but it less noisy than the previous meetings. Some students spent too short in the presentation. There were few students who laughed at their friends and it seemed disturbing the other students' concentration. Some students had difficulties in expressing their arguments and suggestion related to the topics. Few students still dominated the group investigation. There were many mistakes in grammar and pronunciation. It's okay. They were learning. Some students seemed reluctance to speak. Some students were lack of vocabulary. Some of them used Bahasa Indonesia for the words they did not know. Some students were lack of fluency, and they were still difficult to express their ideas. Well, this is a process of learning. The researcher still found many obstacles in this meeting, but in overall it was better than the last meeting of the previous cycle.

In the second meeting of cycle 2, the researcher found that this meeting was much better. The students made report and presented the result of their investigation. The students were not too noisy because they had to make a summary. Most of the students made it, but not all. Few students did not make summary, because they got difficulty in making the summary. Some students (four or five) mispronounced some difficult words. Few students were lack of vocabulary. Some students were more fluent to speak English, and they could express their ideas in reporting the group investigation result. One group got difficulties in performing the report of group investigation. The students seemed working hard together. Few students were still inhibited by their lack of vocabulary, but fear of making mistakes is not the issue. The students who did not understand to say some English vocabularies, they became silent or used Bahasa Indonesia.

In the third meeting of cycle 2, the researcher found that almost all students involved in doing group investigation. It seemed they liked and enjoyed doing it. The presentations were enjoyable to the students. The students were motivated to involve in the activity. The students could express their ideas. The students' vocabulary increased. Few students were still lack of vocabulary. The reluctance was reduced. Most of the students seemed not to worry of making mistakes. The students' confidence was raised. They were not afraid of being laughed at by other students. This meeting is much better than previous meetings.

In Cycle 2, the researcher found that group investigation is a challenging speaking teaching model. Some obstacles were still found in the implementation of it. By conducting group investigation, they learnt how to investigate a certain problem and to solve the problem using English. They learnt how to share, to discuss, to give their ideas, how to accept other opinions, and how to present their ideas. The following section will present the data of students' speaking achievement and the students' participation found from Cycle 2.

To know the result of the implementation of group investigation in cycle 2, the researcher conducted a speaking test. The steps of speaking test were: asking 3-4 students came forward, giving a picture to be described, the pictures were: things, animal, human, class, canteen etc, presenting the test, and scoring the students' speaking proficiency based on scoring guide adapted and modified from Tunku Mohtar in Foley (2005:224). The speaking aspects scored were grammar, pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, and content.

It was found that the average score of delivery aspects from researcher was 3.11, and collaborator was 3.18, meanwhile the average score was 3.14. Based on the rating employed by the researcher and the collaborator in assessing the students' speaking performance, it was revealed that the students' average score was 3.14. In this area of score, the ability was qualified as 'good'.

The students' average score in Cycle 2 was higher that the students' score in Cycle 1, the students' score in Cycle 1 was higher than the average score in preliminary study. It revealed that the average preliminary study score was 2.71, the average score in Cycle 1 was 2.89, and the average score in Cycle 2 was 3.14. It means that there was an improvement of the students' speaking ability.

Based on the data presented above, it was found that the implementation of group investigation in speaking class presented a good progress. The average score of the students' speaking in Cycle 1 was 2.89, and the average score of the students' speaking in Cycle 2 was 3.14. Based on the rating in assessing the students' speaking performance, it was revealed that the students' average score was 3.14. In this area of score, the ability was qualified as 'good'. It meant that the criterion of success was fulfilled, that was 'good'.

In getting the data on the students' participation in the teaching-learning process, the researcher used observation sheet of student's participation. The observation sheet consisted of 4 indicators (sharing, discussing, clarifying, and synthesizing) to see the students' involvement during the implementation of the group investigation.

There are four aspects indicating a student participated in a group investigation, they are: sharing, discussing, clarifying, and synthesizing. Two students performed all

the 4 indicators in Cycle 1 Meeting 1, fourteen students did all the 4 indicators in Meeting 2, and seventeen students did all the 4 indicators in Meeting 3. In group investigation, the students have to share, discuss, clarify, and synthesize the information. Most of the students can do sharing and discussing, but not all students can do clarifying and synthesizing.

The findings showed that there was an improvement on the students' participation in the speaking class by using group investigation. In Cycle 2 Meeting 1, 70% of the students were actively involved in the teaching and learning process, whereas in Meeting 3, it was 76 % of the students actively participated in the teaching and learning process. It means that the improvement of the students' involvement from Cycle 2 Meeting 1 to Meeting 3 was 8.57%.

The improvement of the implementation of group investigation not only gave positive effect to the students' score in Cycle 2, but it also could improve the students' participation in the teaching and learning process. The result of the data analysis indicated that the students' participation or involvement in teaching-learning process – 76%– was success. Actually, it was a slight improvement, but it was enough to reach the criterion of success, that was 70%.

To get a better undestanding about the implementation of group investigation from the students' perspective, the researcher distributed the questionnaires the students to get the data. The questions were made in Bahasa Indonesia to make it clearer for the students.

The findings shows that : 1) most of the students (44%) think that *Group Investigation* improve their knowledge and make it essier for them to express their edieas, 2) most of the students (53%) enjoy learning by using *Group Investigation*, 3) most of the students (56%) thinkt that *Group Investigation* applicable in the class of speaking, 4) most of the students (65%) think that *Group Investigation* improve their speaking skill, 5) most of the students (62%) think that *Group Investigation* help them in speaking English, 6) most of the students (59%) think that *Group Investigation* improve their self confidence, and 7) most of the students (59%) think that *Group Investigation* improve their motivation in learning English.

E. Discussion

This classroom action research conducted based on the teaching of speaking problems faced by the students of SMA 2 Samarinda. Based on the researcher's experience in SMA 2 Samarinda, she found many problems related to speaking. Most of the students were less motivated in speaking task. Some of the students really want to express their ideas and feelings but they do not know how to express their ideas. Some of the students know how to construct sentences but they are reluctant to speak. They are afraid of making mistakes. They are also afraid of being laughed at by other students, so they just keep silent and keep their ideas and feelings in their mind.

A preliminary study was done in order to get the information about the speaking problem faced by the students. The preliminary was conducted by interviewing the students in English. The researcher addressed 10 English questions about English in general and about speaking. From this preliminary study, she got the information that some of the students were less motivated in doing the speaking task. It seemed that they are afraid of being laughed at by other students, so they just keep silent and keep

their ideas and feelings in their mind. Some of the students really want to express their ideas and feelings but they do not know how to express their ideas. Some of the students know how to construct sentences but they are reluctant to speak. They are afraid of making mistakes. In that preliminary study, the researcher also scored the speaking skill of the students and the result was not so good. There were only 6 students could be categorized as 'good' based on the 1-5 scale from Tunku Mohtar (in Foley, 2005:224). Most of the students were categorized as 'fair' and one student, 'poor'.

From the above explanation, the researcher knew that the problems of speaking at SMA 2 Samarinda can be formulated into two areas; (1) students' speaking achievement, and (2) the students' motivation in speaking. Nunan (1999) states that the ability to function in another language is generally characterized in terms of being able to speak that language. People measure the mastery of a language by seeing whether one can speak the language or not. Nunan (1999) also states that many English learners are reluctant and unmotivated. Meanwhile, Gebhard (1996) states that one of the problems faced by EFL learners is *the students' won't talk* problem. Some students will not talk because they are too shy or have such high levels of anxiety over speaking.

To overcome the speaking problem above, Nunan (1999) gives some suggestions: (1) for reluctant students, engage in a certain amount of learner training to encourage them to participate in speaking, and (2) for unmotivated students, link learners to the need and interests of the learners, allow them to bring their own knowledge and perspectives into the learning process, encourage creative language use, and develop ways in which learners can record their own progress. One of the appropriate model for this purpose is Group Investigation (GI).

Slavin (2008) states that group investigation is related to the activities of collecting, analyzing, and synthesizing information in order to solving a multi-task problem. The students can look for any information from the inside or outside the classroom, such as: books, institution, or society. Group investigation has the advantage to reach the students' learning goal. In the same book, Slavin (2008) argues that cooperative learning techniques including group investigation is helpful to achieve personal learning goal by achieving group learning goal. If a member of a group wants to achieve his/her goal, she/he must help achieving the group goal. By doing together to get the group goal, the students can apply an appropriate way to get the success in learning. In cooperative learning classroom, the higher students help the lower achievers.

Based on the above explanation, the researcher conducted a study in the issue of the implementation of group investigation to improve the students' speaking skill of SMA 2 Samarinda. The objectives of the study were to describe:

1) How group investigation improves the student's speaking ability of second grade students of SMA 2 Samarinda.
2) How group investigation improves the student's motivation in speaking of second grade students of SMA 2 Samarinda.
3) What the obstacles are in the implementation of Group Investigation.

The implementation of group investigation was done in six steps based on Slavin's idea (Slavin, 2008) that in implementing group investigation it can be done in

the steps of: identifying the topic and organizing pupils into groups, planning the learning task, carrying out the investigation, preparing a final report, presenting the final report, and evaluation. Figuring out the steps, the implementation of group investigation technique started from identifying topics that can really influence the further steps.

The research findings showed that the criteria of success had been fulfilled. In the aspect of students' speaking skill, it revealed that the average preliminary study score was 2.71, the average score of the students' speaking in Cycle 1 was 2.89, and the average score of the students' speaking in Cycle 2 was 3.14. Based on the rating in assessing the students' speaking performance, the ability was qualified as 'good'. It meant that the criterion of success was fulfilled, that was 'good'. There was an improvement of the students' speaking skill from preliminary study, cycle 1, and cycle 2.

Based on Scoring Guide for the Assessment of Speaking proposed by Tunku Mohtar (2005), "Good" category indicated that: the aspect of Pronunciation: A few words are incorrectly pronounced but meaning is not affected. The aspect of Grammar: One or two major errors which affect meaning. The aspect of Vocabulary: Some content words are repeated a number of times. One or two words are not correctly used. The aspect of Fluency: Hesitation is shown in almost every sentence.

The criteria success was not fulfilled in cycle 1, some improvement of the implementation of Group Investigation (GI) were made in cycle 2 in the form of:
   a) Motivate the students to speak English.
   b) Motivate the students not to be shy in learning speaking.
   c) Manage the time.
   d) Simplify the instruction.
   e) Teach how to make a simple presentation.
   f) Teach how to make suggestion based on the argument.
   g) Supply with appropriate vocabulary for the topic of group investigation.
   h) Use a brainstorming.
   i) Prepare a media/picture

The improvement of the implementation of group investigation in cycle 2 had a good impact in improving the students' speaking skill. Before the implementation of group investigation, most of the students were less motivated in speaking task. They do not know how to express their ideas. Some of the students know how to construct sentences but they are reluctant to speak. They are afraid of making mistakes. They are also afraid of being laughed at by other students, so they just keep silent and keep their ideas and feelings in their mind. After the implementation of group investigation (in cycle 2), the students were motivated to involve in the activity. The students could express their ideas. The students' vocabulary increased. The reluctance was reduced. Most of the students seemed not to worry of making mistakes. The students' confidence was raised. They were not afraid of being laughed at by other students.

From the above arguments, it can be concluded that Group Investigation (GI) improves the students' speaking ability by (1) increasing the students' pronunciation, grammatical, vocabulary, and fluency, (2) by reducing the students' reluctance to speak, worry of making mistakes, and afraid of being laughed at by other students.

In the aspect of students' participation, in Cycle 1 meeting 1, 48% of the students were actively involved in the teaching and learning process, In Cycle 1 meeting 2, 58% of the students were actively involved, whereas in Cycle 1 meeting 3, it was 63 % of the students participated. In Cycle 2 meeting 1, 70% of the students were actively involved in the teaching and learning process, in Cycle 2 meeting 2, 71% of the students were actively involved, whereas in Cycle 2 meeting 3, it was 76 % of the students actively participated. It means that the improvement of the students' involvement from Cycle 1 to Cycle 2 was 58.33%. The criterion of success was also fulfilled, that was 70%.

Based on Slavin's idea (Slavin, 2008), the implementation of group investigation was done in six steps, they are: 1) identifying the topic and organizing pupils into groups, 2) planning the learning task, 3) carrying out the investigation, 4) preparing a final report, 5) presenting the final report, and 6) evaluation. The findings of the study shows that the students could improve their motivation in learning English by doing the steps of group investigation. They learnt a lot of things from this activity, specially how they improve their motivation in learning English.

From the above point, the researcher concludes that Group Investigation (GI) also improves the students' motivation in speaking by 1) the students learnt how to investigate a certain problem and to solve the problem using English, 2) how to share, 3) how to discuss, 4) how to give their ideas, 5) how to accept other opinions, and 6) how to present their ideas.

From the findings of the study, the researcher also found some obstacles in the implementation of group investigation, the obstacle are: The students were noisy, Some students spent too short in the presentation, Some students had difficulties in expressing their arguments and suggestion related to the topics, and Few students dominated the group investigation.

The key success of the implementation on this group investigation was the improvement or the adjustment of GI in some ways. Some improvement of the implementation of group investigation were made in the form of: Motivate the students to speak English, Motivate the students not to be shy in learning speaking, Manage the time, Simplify the instruction, Teach how to make a simple presentation, Teach how to make suggestion based on the argument, Supply with appropriate vocabulary for the topic of group investigation, Use a brainstorming, and Prepare a media/picture.

Group investigation is a good alternative model in the teaching of speaking. Group investigation can improve the students' speaking in the second grade students at SMA Negeri 2 Samarinda. The result of this study supports the result of previous related studies of Herwinda (2010) that Group Investigation (GI) method can improve the students' capability to finish the comparison story problem. It also supports the conclusion made by Sumanti (2010) that the application of cooperative teaching and learning model of the Investigation Group (GI) can increase the appreciating folktale ability on the tenth grade students at SMA. It also gives positive effects for the teaching and learning concluded by Rizan (2011) that cooperative learning could enhance the students' performance.

F. Conclusions

After the implementation of Group Investigation through two cycles, the researcher concludes: Group Investigation improved the students' speaking ability by a) increasing the students' pronunciation, grammatical, vocabulary, and fluency, b) by reducing the students' reluctance to speak, worry of making mistakes, and afraid of being laughed at by other students. Group Investigation improved the students' motivation in speaking by a) the students learnt how to investigate a certain problem and to solve the problem using English, b) how to share, c) how to discuss, d) how to give their ideas, e) how to accept other opinions, and f) how to present their ideas. The obstacles in the implementation of Group Investigation are: a) The students were noisy, b) Some students spent too short in the presentation, c) Some students had difficulties in expressing their arguments and suggestion related to the topics, and d) Few students dominated the group investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argawati, Ningtyas Orilina. (2014). Improving Students' Speaking Skill Using Group Discussion: Experimental study on the First Grade Students of Senior High School. *ELTIN Journal,* 2(2).

Cohen E. G., et all. (2004). *Teaching Cooperating LearningNo Title.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Gebhard, J. G. (1996). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Teacher Self- Development and Methodology Guide.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Gebhard, J. G. (2000). *Teaching English as A Foreign or Second Language: A Teacher Self- Development and Methodology Guide.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Harmer, J. (2001a). *How To Teach English. An Introduction to the practice of English Language Teaching.* New York: Addision Wesley Longman.

Harmer, J. (2001b). *Practice of English Language Teaching.* UK: Cambridge.

Hedge, T. (2003). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herwinda, T. (2010). *The use of group investigation Method to improve the students capability in finishing The story problem of comparison topic.* Sebelas Maret University Surakarta.

McNiff, J. (1988). *Action Research: Principles and Practice.* New York: Macmillan Education. Ltd.

Mufidah, Asrarul. (2015). *The Application of Group Investigation (GI) in Speaking Class by an English Teacher at Tenth Gradeof SMAN 4 Kediri In Academic Year 2015-2016.* Unpublished Thesis: Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning.* Boston: Heinle Publishers.

Sangadji, Sopiah. (2016). Implementation of cooperative learning with group investigation model to improve learning Achievement of vocational school students in Indonesia. *International Journal of Learning & Development,* 6(1).

Sharan, Y., & Sharan, S. (1989). *Group Investigation: Expanding Cooperative Learning.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Slavin, R. E. (2008). *Cooperative Learning.* Bandung: Nusa Media.

Sumanti. (2010). *The Application of Co-operative Teaching and Learning Model of the Investigation Group (GI) to Increase the Appreciating Folktale Ability on the Tenth Grade Students of F at SMA 1 Gemolong, Sragen Regency in 2009/2010*. Sebelas Maret University.

Tunku Mohtar, T. M. (2005). Teachers' Perception Towards Oral Assessment and Their Implications for Teaching. In *New Dimension in The Teaching of Oral Communication*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.