



## Development of an Exposition Writing Learning Model Based on Guided Group Investigation for Students of Class VIII of SMP in Gowa District

Andi Syamsul Alam

Study Program Education Language And Literature  
Indonesia Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Muhammadiyah University of Makassar

Email : [auva8283@gmail.com](mailto:auva8283@gmail.com)

Receive: 10/06/2023

Accepted: 11/07/2023

Published: 01/10/2023

### Abstract

This research is a development research that generally aims to describe the development of an exposition writing learning model based on guided group investigation for grade VIII students of SMP Negeri 1 Karunrung, Bajeng Barat District, Gowa Regency. The development method used follows the Four-D development design and the research design used is one group pretest-posttest. The collected data were analyzed descriptively quantitatively. The results of the study showed (1) Producing a valid guided group investigation-based exposition writing learning model for class VIII students of SMP Negeri 1 Karunrung, Gowa Regency with the steps as described in the design of the learning model that has been developed and also described in the RPP. (2) the implementation of the guided group investigation-based exposition writing learning form, especially the implementation of the RPP, was carried out well, namely in trial I it obtained an average score of 3.54, in trial II the average was 3.75, (3) student activities were carried out well, namely in trial I it obtained an average score of 3.59, in trial II, the average was 4.0, (4) the exposition writing learning outcome test was carried out well, namely in trial I, namely: in the pretest it produced 0.55 (unsuccessful), while in the posttest it increased to 0.86 (successful). Trial II, the pretest conducted resulted in 0.60 (unsuccessful), while in the posttest it increased to 0.88 (successful), (5) student responses to the developed learning model were carried out well, namely in trial I, responding happily, which was 78.78, in trial II, it increased to 97.56, and (6) obstacles encountered in both trials I and II, namely the class was less conducive, especially when forming groups, as well as when students conducted investigations. However, these obstacles can be handled well, so that the learning process continues as expected. From the results of the research conducted, it can be concluded that the developed learning model can improve learning outcomes in writing expositions, which also means that this learning model is very effective for use in learning to write expositions in junior high schools.

Keywords: *model development, writing investigation-based expositions*

### A. Introduction

Indonesian language learning aims to improve students' ability to communicate in good and correct Indonesian, both verbally and in writing, and to foster appreciation for Indonesian literary works. The scope of Indonesian language teaching includes four aspects of language skills, namely listening skills, speaking skills, reading skills, and writing skills.

In relation to writing skills, writing skills are one of the productive written language skills that students need to have in order to be able to communicate in writing. Therefore, the role of Indonesian language learning, especially the aspect of writing skills in junior high schools, is important. Indonesian language learning in the aspect of writing is directed at the skill of expressing ideas and feelings in writing.

Writing can also be perceived as part of cultural literacy that can be used as a medium for self-development. However, the objective condition that occurs in Indonesian students to this day is that alliteration is still a culture, namely students who can read and write, but do not like to read and write. In accordance with this statement, USAID (2015:11) states that the literacy (reading and writing) conditions of Indonesian students are below average. In addition, the reality in schools also shows that learning Indonesian, especially writing as part of literacy activities, has not been encouraging. This fact can be seen in the lack of interest in writing for students at school. They prefer to play or tell stories with their deskmates or even leave the writing assignments given by their teachers.

Another fact, as empirical evidence related to this, is that the learning process carried out by teachers is very monotonous, and the review of academic learning outcomes is very low. From the results of the interview, information was also obtained that students have not been able to express ideas and develop ideas in writing regularly and systematically, are less interested and less motivated to write, coupled with the teaching techniques used by teachers are not interesting. Therefore, the author concludes that writing skills still seem to receive very little attention.

Based on the description, it is necessary to use another appropriate learning model to teach students. The learning model that provides hope for solving the problem is a model and strategy that has the characteristics of (1) directing teachers to treat students individually and in groups, (2) having class interaction in

learning, both interaction between students and between teachers and students, and (3) placing process assessment and learning outcome assessment as equally important in learning.

The model that the researcher means is "Exposition Writing Learning Model Based on Guided Group Investigation for Grade VIII Junior High School Students".

The problem that then arises is how to develop a valid and effective guided group investigation-based learning model in improving writing skills in junior high schools? To obtain a solution to the problem, the researcher decided to conduct a study entitled "Development of a Guided Group Investigation-Based Exposition Writing Learning Model for Junior High School Students in Gowa Regency". The use of a guided group investigation-based learning model in writing learning has never been used in the teaching and learning process in junior high schools. Therefore, this study is very important to be carried out.

### **Writing Expositions**

Exposition is a type of discourse that is intended to explain, convey, or describe something that can expand or increase the knowledge and views of the reader. The goal is to inform something without any intention of influencing the thoughts, feelings, and attitudes of the reader.

The facts and illustrations presented by the author simply clarify what will be conveyed. The purpose of expository writing according to Eti (2005) (in Dalman, 2015:121) is to provide information or explanations as clearly as possible about the object, even though the reader has never experienced or observed it themselves, without forcing others to accept ideas and information. Expository writers must be able to develop an object in detail so that all aspects or elements that are considered necessary to be explained are truly understood. According to Taylor (1982:34) students who learn to make summaries are able to remember expository discourse better and they have greater sensitivity to organizing expository writing discourse so that it is clearer and can be supplemented with descriptions, examples, pictures, graphic figures, and so on.

### **Guided Group Investigation**

Guided group investigation in this study is also one of the cooperative learning models by maximizing student involvement during the

expository writing learning process. The advantages of the guided group investigation model are (1) increasing high student learning motivation, (2) student involvement is very high, and (3) students do not feel bored and do not make things up in writing, because it comes from the results of their investigation. In addition, this model will provide accompanying impacts to students, such as cross-field learning.

## B. Research Methods

Type of Research Based on the purpose of this study, which is to produce a learning model for writing expositions based on guided group investigations for junior high school students, this study is included in development research (Research & Development), which is a research activity by developing and validating data and products. One of the products developed in this study is the guided group investigation learning model (PMBIKT). The guided group investigation model (PMBIKT) is a modification of the previous model, namely the group investigation model (IK) in writing expositions for junior high school students.

This product will be a model for teachers when carrying out the Indonesian language learning process, especially learning to write expositions in junior high schools, especially in learning writing skills. This product is a learning model for writing expositions based on guided group investigations for grade VIII junior high school students in Gowa Regency.

## Data Analysis

Techniques The data that has been collected using the instruments, then analyzed quantitatively and directed to determine the validity, practicality, and effectiveness of the learning model that has been developed. Data obtained from the validation results by experts were analyzed to determine the validity, practicality, and effectiveness of the use of the guided group investigation learning model in improving the exposition writing skills of grade VIII junior high school students.

## C. RESEARCH RESULT

### Research Results

This chapter describes the results of the research that has been carried out, namely the form of developing an exposition writing learning model based on guided group investigation. This research took place in two stages, namely (1) The results of developing an exposition writing learning model based on guided group investigation and (2) implementing an exposition writing learning model based on guided group investigation in real terms (real testing) in the classroom.

#### 1. Development Results of Guided Group Investigation-Based Expository Writing Learning Model

The results of the development of a guided group investigation-based exposition writing learning model are a modification of the previous learning model, namely the group investigation learning model developed by Shalomon Sharan which consists of six syntax or learning stages. The modification results in the PMBIKT learning model. This means that the design of this model develops exposition writing skills based on guided group investigations with a pattern or guided group investigation steps consisting of eight phases or eight steps and adds a form of guidance activities that will be carried out by teachers in learning. The PMBIKT model implements eight steps, namely (1) Orientation, (2) Identifying topics and organizing students into groups, (3) Planning tasks to be learned, (4) Carrying out investigations, (5) Preparing final reports, (6) Presenting final reports, (7) Evaluation, (8) Providing reinforcement and awards. The results of the modification of the guided group investigation-based exposition writing learning model are depicted in the chart as follows The following.

#### 1. Meeting First

Before students are given learning treatment, students are first given pre-test questions with the aim of determining students' initial abilities.

After completing the post-test questions, the researcher then gave questionnaire readiness

The following.

**GUIDED GROUP  
INVESTIGATION-BASED  
WRITING LEARNING MODEL**

<u><b>GUIDANCE</b></u>	<u><b>SYNTHESIS</b></u>	<u><b>STUDENT ACTIVITY</b></u>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explaining the material, stages, and learning objectives</li> <li>2. Direct students to form groups, determine topics, and facilitate organization.</li> <li>3. Guiding students in planning tasks/topics</li> <li>4. The teacher guides students to gather information and reminds students to contribute to</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Orientation</li> <li>2. Identify topics and organize students into groups</li> <li>3. Planning the task to be learned</li> <li>4. Conduct guided group investigations</li> <li>5. Prepare the final report</li> <li>6. Present the final report</li> <li>7. Evaluation</li> <li>8. Providing reinforcement and rewards</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pay attention, listen, and take notes on teacher orientation</li> <li>2. Form groups, study the topic and research some sources</li> <li>3. Plan together the task to be learned</li> <li>4. Collect and exchange information and discuss it.</li> <li>5. Plan what to report and coordinate to determine the presentation plan</li> </ol>

then explain the stages that will be carried out during learning in the hope that students will understand the learning phases regularly and not be confused in participating in learning, in this case writing expositions, then explain the learning objectives so that students know the benefits or uses of learning that will be followed.

**2. Phase Identifying the Topic and Organizing Students into Groups**

The first step is to organize students into groups and let them decide on the topic they will study. The implementation of this step may vary. In one case the teacher may choose one topic and then just form groups. In other cases, students are formed into groups and then each group determines the topic to be studied/written about. In this study, the researcher determined the topics to be written by the students after they were organized into

groups of 5-6 students per group. The determination of 5-6 people per group is based on the opinion of Ibrahim (2006: 23) that the number of group members in the group investigation technique consists of 5 or 6 people.



The group formation process in this study was carried out by considering the heterogeneity of students, namely a combination of low, medium, and high ability students, then different social status, and different genders.

**3. Phase Planning the Task to be Learned**

Prior to the assignment, students were divided into groups (as in point b) and involved in identifying the following: (1) in what form the information is obtained, (2) how it is obtained, and (3) where or who the information is, according to the problem discussed. After students understand this, division is then carried out. Students are given the freedom to determine whether the tasks are done in parallel or complementary. Complementary, if each group completes a different subtopic to unify perceptions of the topic. While parallel, if all groups work on the same task, to see students' perspectives on the same topic.

**4. Phase Conducting the Guided Group Investigation**

Once the groups have been formed, the topics have been assigned, and the groups have planned their work programs, the groups are ready to implement their plans with direct teacher guidance in the field. This stage is usually the longest. Students need time to design data collection procedures, collect data, analyze and evaluate data, and draw conclusions.

**5. Final Report Preparation Phase**

Once students have acquired the information, they need to analyze and evaluate it. At this stage, the teacher can provide assistance as necessary. Teacher assistance can be in the form of (a) focusing students' attention on the question or problem being investigated, (b) directing students to share findings with all

group members, and (c) encouraging students to experiment with different ways of presenting data. Next, students prepare a report on the results of their investigation. The report can be done orally or in writing. In this study, the report is in the form of writing (LKS) which is presented orally in front of the class.

#### **6. Final Report Presentation Phase**

Presenting the investigation report has two purposes, namely (a) disseminating information, (b) helping students learn to present information clearly and interestingly. The format of presenting the report can vary, such as presentations for the whole class, presentations in the form of posters, demonstrations, presentations of video recordings, and learning centers.

#### **7. Evaluation Phase**

For guided group inquiry activities, it should be based on the main purpose of implementing this model. So, the evaluation carried out on learning to write expositions in this study is seen from group and individual reports, assigning students to explain their work, oral presentations, and interviews, as well as observations during the learning activities.

#### **8. Reinforcement and Reward Phase**

The results of hard work and student participation in learning need to be appreciated or rewarded (rewarded) because in learning it is very important for student teachers to always encourage and motivate, so that students are always interested and interested in participating in the learning process and so that learning can be memorable and meaningful for students.

#### **A. Implementation of Guided Group Investigation-based Expository Writing Learning Model**

The learning model that has been validated by experts was tested on students of class VIII of SMP Negeri 1 Karunrung, Gowa Regency. The initial test ( *pretest* ) was

conducted before using the learning model to see the initial abilities of students. The final test ( *posttest* ) was carried out after the trial of the guided group investigation technique exposition writing learning model. There were 2 observers in this study, namely the 8th grade Indonesian language teacher at the research school (Satria, S.Pd.) and one of the lecturer colleagues, namely (Dr. Tarman Andi Arief, M.Pd.). In order for the observation results to be more accurate, the two observers were given an assessment rubric which was used as a guide in determining the number (score) of each aspect of the assessment. The research subjects in the first trial were 10 students of class VIIIA students of class VIII SMP Negeri 1 Karunrung Gowa Regency, while the second trial in the real class was held in the same school, namely in class VIIIB totaling 28 people. Trial I was conducted on September 3-19, 2016.

The implementation of the exposition writing learning model with guided group investigation technique was carried out by the researcher/researcher who acted as a teacher and was observed by two observers, namely one of the 8th grade teachers of SMP Negeri 1 Karunrung Gowa Regency and one of the lecturer colleagues. The explanation of the results of trial I and trial II that have been carried out, namely the implementation of lesson plans, student activities, student learning outcomes tests, and student responses to the developed learning model, is described in detail below.

#### **B. Implementation of Guided Group Investigation-based Expository Writing Learning Model**

The learning model that has been validated by experts was tested on students of class VIII of SMP Negeri 1 Karunrung, Gowa Regency. The initial test ( *pretest* ) was conducted before using the learning model to see the initial abilities of students. The final test ( *posttest* ) was carried out after the trial of the guided group investigation technique exposition writing learning model. There were

2 observers in this study, namely the 8th grade Indonesian language teacher at the research school (Satria, S.Pd.) and one of the lecturer colleagues, namely (Dr. Tarman Andi Arief, M.Pd.). In order for the observation results to be more accurate, the two observers were given an assessment rubric which was used as a guide in determining the number (score) of each aspect of the assessment. The research subjects in the first trial were 10 students of class VIIIA students of class VIII SMP Negeri 1 Karunrung Gowa Regency, while the second trial in the real class was held in the same school, namely in class VIIIB totaling 28 people. Trial I was conducted on September 3-19, 2016.

The implementation of the exposition writing learning model with guided group investigation technique was carried out by the researcher/researcher who acted as a teacher and was observed by two observers, namely one of the 8th grade teachers of SMP Negeri 1 Karunrung Gowa Regency and one of the lecturer colleagues. The explanation of the results of trial I and trial II that have been carried out, namely the implementation of lesson plans, student activities, student learning outcomes tests, and student responses to the developed learning model, is described in detail below.

### 1. Implementation of the lesson plan

The implementation of the lesson plan (instrument 1) was seen from three main activities observed by the observer, namely the *implementation* consisting of the introduction, core activities, closing, *time management*, and *classroom atmosphere*. Based on the observation of the implementation of the lesson plan in trial I, the average activities in the introduction were first. 01 = 3.63, pert. 02 = 3.63, and pert. 03 = 3.63, and the average for the three percent. = 3.63. The average for core activities, namely pert. 01 = 3.38, pert. 02 = 3.44, and pert. 03 = 3.56, and the average for the three percent. = 3.46. The mean for closing activities, namely pert. 01 = 3.50, pert. 02 = 3.33, and pert. 03 = 3.47, and the average for the three percent. = 3.50. The mean for time management, namely pert. 01

= 3.50, pert. 02 = 3.50, and pert. 03 = 3.50, and the average for the three percent. = 3.50. and the average for classroom atmosphere, namely pert. 01 = 3.5, pert. 02 = 3.50, and pert. 03 = 3.75, and the average for all three percent = 3.58. The numbers presented as the results of observations from both observers are in the good category so that they can be continued in trial II. The results of the analysis also show that the level of reliability between the two observers is quite high. The coefficient of reliability between two observers on the implementation of the lesson plan developed by the researcher in the first trial was: pert. 01 = 94.31, pert. 02 = 93.96, and pert. 03 = 98.27, and the average for the overall observation of the three meetings was 95.52. According to Borich (1994), if the reliability coefficient between two observers of the implementation of a learning instrument/device is  $\geq 0.75$ , the instrument is categorized as good and can be used for further learning activities. By looking at the level of reliability of observations in trial I, this research can be continued in trial II in the real class. Trial II was conducted on October 8-24, 2016 in a real class with 28 students. The learning model used in Trial II was the same as in Trial I but the material was different. The results of the trial I have revised according to suggestions and notes given by observers and analysis of the results of observations. The results of observations in Trial II showed that the reliability of the scores given by observers to the implementation of the learning process with the model developed by the researcher was quite stable. The average acquisition of activities in the introduction is pert. 01 = 3.63, pert. 02 = 3.75, and pert. 03 = 3.88, and the average for the three percent = 3.75. The average for core activities, namely pert. 01 = 3.63, pert. 02 = 3.75, and pert. 03 = 3.81, and the average for the three percent. = 3.73. The mean for closing activities, namely pert. 01 = 3.33, pert. 02 = 3.67, and pert. 03 = 3.50, and the average for the three percent. = 3.56. The mean for time management, namely pert. 01 = 4.00, pert. 02 = 4.00, and pert. 03 = 3.50, and the average for the three percent. = 3.83. and the average for classroom atmosphere, namely

pert. 01 = 3.50, pert. 02 = 3.75, and pert. 03 = 4.00, and the average for all three percent = 3.75. The numbers presented as the results of observations from both observers were in the good category. The analysis also showed that the level of reliability between the two observers was quite high. The coefficient of reliability between two observers on the implementation of the lesson plan developed by the researcher in the first trial was: pert. 01 = 94.62, pert. 02 = 98.66, and pert. 03 = 96.12, and the average for the overall observation of the three meetings was 96.47. By looking at the level of reliability of observations in this trial II which is in the good category, it can be said that the implementation or applicability of the learning model developed is in the good category.

## 2. Student Activities

Student activities (instrument 2) in learning to write expositions with a guided group investigation model are obtained from the results of observations by two observers using. Categories of student activity during learning, namely: paying attention to learning objectives, listening to topic explanations, involvement in schemata generation, involvement in group formation, understanding tasks, conducting learning interactions, involvement in conducting investigations, involvement in completing group responsibilities, using available media, completing reports, reporting investigation results, responding to reports, mutual respect between individuals, working cooperatively, effectiveness of group processes, and responding to evaluations. The results of the calculation of student activity scores during learning can be seen in appendix 2b. In detail, the percentage data is presented in the following table.

The results of observing student activities show that the component of paying attention to learning objectives in pert. 01 = 3.8, pert. 02 = 3.6, pert. 03 = 3.8, and the average of the three meetings is 3.7, listening to the topic explanation in first. 01 = 3.7, pert.

02 = 3.5, pert. 03 = 3.8, and the average of the three meetings is 3.8, involvement in the generation of schemata on pert. 01 = 3.4, pert. 02 = 3.6, pert. 03 = 3.6, and the average of the three meetings is 3.5, involvement in group formation in pert. 01 = 3.7, pert. 02 = 3.2, pert. 03 = 3.6, and the average of the three meetings is 3.5, understanding the task on first. 01 = 4.0, pert. 02 = 3.5, pert. 03 = 3.5, and the average of the three meetings is 3.6, conducting learning interactions on pert. 01 = 3.5, pert. 02 = 4.0, pert. 03 = 3.8, and the average of the three meetings is 3.7, involvement in conducting investigations on pert. 01 = 3.6, pert. 02 = 3.3, pert. 03 = 3.5, and the average of the three meetings is 3.5, involvement in completing group responsibilities on the company. 01 = 4.0, pert. 02 = 3.7, pert. 03 = 3.5, and the average of the three meetings is 3.7, using the available media on pert. 01 = 3.5, pert. 02 = 3.5, pert. 03 = 3.8, and the average of the three meetings is 3.6, completing the report on pert. 01 = 3.7, pert. 02 = 3.6, pert. 03 = 3.7, and the average of the three meetings is 3.7, reporting the results of the investigation in pert. 01 = 3.7, pert. 02 = 3.7, pert. 03 = 4.0, and the average of the three meetings is 3.8 responding to the report at first. 01 = 3.5, pert. 02 = 3.5, pert. 03 = 3.4, and the average of the three meetings is 3.4, mutual respect between individuals at pert. 01 = 3.9, pert. 02 = 3.5, pert. 03 = 3.6, and the average of the three meetings is 3.6, working cooperatively in pert. 01 = 3.6, pert. 02 = 3.5, pert. 03 = 3.5, and the average of the three meetings is 3.5, the effectiveness of the group process on first. 01 = 3.4, pert. 02 = 3.5, pert. 03 = 3.6, and the average of the three meetings is 3.6, and responding to evaluation on first. 01 = 3.5, pert. 02 = 3.6, pert. 03 = 3.7, and the average of the three meetings is 3.6.

The reliability of the two observers was quite high, namely: pert. 01 = 96.08, pert. 02 = 94.66, and pert. 03 = 96.53, while the average for the overall observation of the three meetings was 95.47. The calculation of the reliability of student activity instruments

in learning to write expositions using guided group investigation techniques for trial I was above 75%. Borich (1994) said that the observation instrument is said to be good if it is above 75%. Thus, it can be said that students' activities during the learning process in trial I were categorized as good and could be continued in the next trial. The calculation of the reliability of student activity instruments in learning to write expositions using guided group investigation techniques in trial II is quite high, namely: pert. 01 = 97.63, pert. 02 = 96.47, and pert. 03 = 97.61, while the average for the overall observation of the three meetings was 97.24 in other words, the reliability was above 75%. Thus, the student activity observation instrument in learning to write exposition used is in the good category

### **3. Expository Writing Learning Outcome Test**

The learning outcome test (instrument 3) was used to determine student learning outcomes as seen from the success of student learning outcomes. The test is used as an initial test and final test. The assessment of exposition writing learning outcomes is said to be successful or meet the expected competencies in the learning objectives if the score obtained by students has reached 65% for individual completeness and 85% for classical completeness/success in accordance with the success standards set at the school where the research took place. The recapitulation of students' exposition writing learning outcomes in the first trial showed that 100% of students' learning outcomes could be said to be successful because the average score obtained ranged from 0.783% to 0.91%. In other words, individually and classically the students' learning outcomes can be said to be successful. The learning outcomes of students' exposition writing in Trial II individually in Trial II ranged from 0.81% to 0.96%. The classical average result was 0.88%. Thus, both individually and classically, the learning outcomes of exposition writing were said to be successful. The recapitulation of students' learning outcomes in tables 4.8 and 4.9 shows

a fundamental difference in the implementation of the initial test (pretest) and the final test (posttest) where in trial I with a total of 10 students there was not a single person whose learning outcomes were successful. It is suspected that the traditional learning habits of the teacher are still attached so that they are confused about where to start writing, they seem very familiar with the topics that have been prepared by the teacher without involving to identify the topics to be discussed together. Meanwhile, in the final test (posttest) after the guided group investigation technique was implemented in learning exposition writing, there was not a single student whose learning results failed. Similarly, in trial II, out of 28 students who were given the initial test, only 5 students had successful learning outcomes and in the final test, 100% of students' learning outcomes were successful. This shows that this model is very suitable to be applied in learning exposition writing .

### **4. Student Response**

The recapitulation data shows that in the 1st point of trial I, students gave a happy response as much as 80%, not happy 20% while in trial II, the happy response was 100% not happy 0%. In the 2nd point, in the first trial, students responded 75% happy and 25% unhappy, in the second trial, students responded 95% happy and 5% unhappy. In point 3, trial I, students gave 76% new responses and 24% not new, while in trial II, 100% new responses and 0% not new. In the 4th point, in the first trial, students gave a new response of 90% and not new only 10%, while in the second trial, the new response was 100% and not new 0%. In the 5th point, trial I, students who gave a happy response were 72%, not happy 28%, while in trial II, the happy response was 95%, not happy 5%. In the 6th point of trial I, students gave a new response of 80% and not new 20%, while in trial II, students gave a new response of 100% and not happy 0%. In the 7th point of trial I, 80% of the responses were happy and 20% were not new, while in trial II, 96% of the responses were new and 4% were not new. The 8th point in pilot test I, happy responses were



90% and not happy 10%, in pilot test II, happy responses were 100% and not happy 0%.

The average overall happy/not new response in trial I was 80% and not happy/not new was 20%. In trial II, the average happy/new response was 98% and not happy/new was 2%. Based on the data in tables 4.6 and 4.7, it shows that the average score given by students is in the good category.

### 5. Constraints in KBM

The obstacles intended in this study can be in the form of teacher activities and student activities that are irrelevant in the learning process, time, facilities and infrastructure and the environment around the classroom, as well as other things that are not in accordance with planning which indirectly hinders the learning process. Teacher activities, for example, the use of time allocations or inefficient classroom management. Student activities include students' lack of enthusiasm in participating in the KBM, students' confusion in doing assignments, and the lack of facilities that they should get.

The basic obstacles encountered during the implementation of learning are:

#### a. Trial I

At the first meeting, which took place on September 03, 2016, at 07.00-08.10, the class atmosphere was not conducive, noisy, disturbing each other, even some students stood up and shouted to call their friends. This happened during group formation, they did not accept if friends who were considered familiar, smart, should be placed in other groups.

The second meeting, which took place on September 12, 2016, at 09.30-10.40, the atmosphere of the class was again chaotic, precisely at the time of the distribution of tasks to find information in local newspapers or magazines "**Fajar and Tribun**", they fought over newspapers. This happened because the availability of newspapers at school was very limited.

The third meeting, which took place on September 19, 2016, at 09.30-10.40, as in the first and second meetings, the class atmosphere remained less conducive. This happened during the presentation of the task by each group. The group members scrambled to represent each other.

#### b. Trial II

The first meeting took place on October 08, 2016, at 07.00-08.10. The thing that happened in the first trial I meeting was repeated, namely during group formation. The students were more likely to group based on friends who were considered close to them.

The second meeting took place on October 15, 2016, at 07.00-08.10. The information sources in the school yard were not sufficient to be used as an object of information gathering for all students.

The third meeting found no obstacles, the learning went very smoothly, the students were very understanding of their respective tasks.

### Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis in trial I, the implementation of the guided group investigation-based exposition writing learning model obtained the following findings:

1. This dissertation has produced a guided group investigation-based exposition writing learning model (PMBIKT) with the following phases. (1) Orientation, (2) Identifying topics and organizing students into groups, (3) Planning tasks to be learned, (4) Carrying out guided group investigations (5) Preparing final reports, (6) Presenting final reports, (7) *Evaluation*, (8) Providing reinforcement and rewards. the development model of writing expositions based on guided group investigations is categorized as good, meaning that the development process meets the criteria of validity and effectiveness.

2. The effectiveness of the PMBIKT model is based on the results of learning implementation, student activities, exposition writing learning test results, student responses, and obstacles encountered during learning.
  - a. In trial I, the average learning implementation was 3.54 with an average reliability of 95.52, in trial II, it was 3.75 with an average reliability of 96.59, meaning that both were categorized as good.
  - b. The frequency of student activities during the learning process of writing exposition with guided group investigation technique in trials I and II was in the good category with an average of 3.59 and 4.0 while the reliability between observers 1 and 2 was 95.47 and 97.24.
  - c. The learning results of students' exposition writing showed a difference before and after being given treatment using a learning model with guided group investigation techniques, namely in trial I, the average score of students in the initial test was 0.55 while in the final test it was 0.84. Trial II, the average score of students in the initial test was 0.60 while in the final test it was 0.88.
  - d. Students' responses to the learning of writing categorized expositions were good. In pilot test I, the happy/new response was 80% while not happy/new was 20%. In trial II, the happy/new response was 98% while not happy/new was only 2%.
  - e. The obstacles encountered during learning in this study both in trial I and trial II, namely the emergence of an attitude of confusion at the beginning of learning, limited facilities and infrastructure, the time used is relatively short while the model to be applied requires a relatively long time,

and this model is classified as a model of learning.

#### Daftar Pustaka

- Abd. Rahman, H. 2015. *Towards Professional and Ethical Teachers*. Yogyakarta: Graha Guru.
- Ahmadi, Mukhsin. 1990. *Basics of Indonesian Composition*. Malang: Asih Asah Anak Foundation.
- Akhari, Sabarti, et al. 1988. *Indonesian Writing Skills*. Jakarta: Erlangga
- Akharga, Sabarti. 2007. *Development of Reading and Writing Skills in Elementary Schools*. IKIP: Jakarta.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi 2013. *Basics of Educational Evaluation*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Borg, Walter R & Gall, Meredith D. 1983. *Educational Research: An Introduction*. London : Longman.
- Borich, GD 1994. *Observation Skills for Effective Teaching* . Englewood Cliffs: Merrill Publishers.
- Brown, Douglas. 1987. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Dalman, H. 2015. *Writing Skills*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Danim, Sudarman and Khaeril. 2011. *Educational Psychology in a New Perspective*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Degeng, Nyoman. 2001. *Guidelines for the Preparation of Teaching Materials (Towards Personal Excellence)*. Malang: LPPP State University of Malang.
- Djumingin, Sulastriningsi. 2015. *Assessment of Indonesian Language Learning*. Makassar: UNM Publishing Agency.
- Eggen, Paul D. & Kauchak, Donald P. 1996. *Strategies for Teachers: Teaching Context and Thinking Skills*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ellis, Rod. 1986. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York:

- Oxford University Press.
- Erwin, et al. 2012. *Learning Theories and Models*. Makassar: Berkah Utami.
- Fachruddn AE 1994. *The Basics of Writing Skills*. Ujung Pandang: Ujung Pandang Teachers' Training College Publishing House.
- Gie, The Liang. 2002. *Skillful Writing*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Hartono, Rudi. 2013. *Variety of Teaching Models that Young Students Accept*. Jakarta: Diva Press.
- Hedley. Alice Omaggio, 1993. *Teaching Language 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Heinle and Heinle Publisher, USA*
- Hill, Susan. 1990. *The Collaborative Classroom: A Guide to Cooperative Learning*. Victoria: Eleanor Curtin Publishing.
- Ministry of National Education. 2011. *Guidelines for the Implementation of Character Education (Based on Experience in Education Units)*. Jakarta: Center for Curriculum and Bookkeeping, Research and Development Agency.
- Kemmis, S. and R. Mc. Taggart. 1988. *The Action Research Planner*. Melbourne, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Kemp, Jerrold. E 1985. *Teaching Design Process*, Translation by AsrilMarjohanEditorRatnaSayekti, Bandung: ITB 1994
- Keraf, G. 1993. *Composition, An Introduction to Language Proficiency*. Bandung: Kanisius.
- Lie, Anita. 2002. *Cooperative Learning, Practicing Cooperative Learning in the Classroom*. Jakarta: Gramedia Wiasarana Indonesia.
- Munirah. 2014. Development of Constructivism-Based Paragraph Writing Learning Model for Students of Indonesian Language and Literature Education Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar.
- Dissertation*. Makassar: UNHAS.
- Munirah. 2015. *Paragraph Writing Development*. Yogyakarta: CV Budi Utama.
- Nurjannah, Nunung. 2004. Application of Constructivism Learning Model in Indonesian Writing Learning. *Dissertation*. Bandung: BPFE.
- Private, Benny. 2011b. *Learning System Design Model; Important Steps to Design Effective and Quality Learning Activities*. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat.
- Salamon. 1989. When Teams Do Not Function the Way They Ought To International Journal of Educational Research. 13, 89-99.
- Salimuddin. 2011. Learning Deductive-Inductive Paragraph Writing by Using Constructivism Approach in Madrasah Aliyah Miftahul Ulum Class in Sukamakmur Sub-district, Bogor Regency in 2011/2012 Academic Year. *Dissertation*. Not published. Surabaya: Unesa.
- Slavin, Robert E. 1995. *Cooperative Learning*. Second Edition. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Solhan, TW 2007. *Indonesian Language Education*. Jakarta: Open University.
- Sugiyono. 2014. Quantitative, Qualitative, and R & D Research Methods, Bandung: Alfabeta.
- SSuprijono, Agus. 2015. *Cooperative Learning, Theory & Application of Paikem*. Yogyakarta: Student Library.
- Thiagarajan, Sivasailam, Semmel. S Dorothy and Semmel. I Melvyn. 1974. *Instructional Development for Training Teachers of Exceptional Children*. Bloomington Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Tolla, Ahmad. 1996. *Study of Communicative Approach in Indonesian Language Learning in Public Secondary Schools in Ujung*

*Pandang* Municipality.  
Dissertation.Unpublished Postgraduate  
Program, Institute of Teacher Training  
and Education Malang.

Trianto. 2014. *Learning Models;  
Concepts, Strategies, and  
Implementation in the Education Unit  
Level Curriculum*. Jakarta: Bumi  
Aksara.

USAID. 2015. *Literacy learning in junior  
secondary schools*. Jakarta: World  
Education.

**Other sources:**

**Horizon Newspaper, November 6, 2016**

[File:///C:/New  
Data/Humanistic%20approaches%20lea  
rning.htm](#) (accessed March 9, 2017)

Theoretical Foundations of Language  
Learning. Makassar State University-  
digilib-unm-achmadtolla.191.1  
collection-u.doc (accessed, March 9,  
2016).

[http://muslich-  
m.blogspot.com/2013/12menulis  
exposition.html](http://muslich-<br/>m.blogspot.com/2013/12menulis<br/>exposition.html) accessed December 12,  
2016