## CHAPTER IV

 DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION
## A. Description of Research

In this chapter, the writer would like to describe and discuss the findings of the research. This study is classroom action research on the use of group investigation method in teaching reading ability. Its purpose is to know the use of group investigation method in teaching reading comprehension ability, and to identify the improvement of students' reading ability.

In this study there were two cycles and before conducted the cycle, the researcher gave preliminary test (the researcher got base score students reading comprehension ability) and compared with each cycle after taught using Group Investigation method. The descriptions of each are as follow:

## 1. Pre-cycle

This activity was done on Sunday, August $1^{\text {st }}$ 2010. In this step Mrs. Sri Wahyuni as the English teacher was used conventional way in teaching reading comprehension. This is done to know students base score of reading comprehension ability.

In this meeting, the teacher was doing teaching learning process as usual, that is reading aloud. But, many students did not pay attention to the teacher. They tended make noisy in class, such as talk with other friend and they do other activity that is not related with learning activity. There were only some students active to ask questions to the teacher. They were Faza Maulina, A. Viki Mahrus, Ana Yuliati, and Zulfa Usnaul Lailin Nida. Furthermore, the teacher gave preliminary test with 20 multiple-choice items to got base score of reading comprehension ability. All of the questions were about descriptive text. It was followed by 41 students from 42 students as the participant of the study. The teacher gave duration one hour lesson that is 40 minutes for them to do the test. The aim of the test was to measure how far students' comprehension ability in
reading text and to know base score of reading when taught using conventional method.

## 2. First Cycle

This activity was done on Saturday August $7^{\text {th }}$ and Sunday August $8^{\text {th }}$ 2010. The teacher announced the result of yesterday's reading test. The teacher told the students score of the test was not satisfying enough.

Here, the teacher brought the students to a clear importance of comprehending the English texts, which can be facilitated through the group-work. The limitation of time made the teacher only did the first step in applying Group Investigation method. The teacher motivated the students that the method would be useful for them. The teacher introduced the role and group investigation learning.

The first cycle was about teaching and learning process and achievement test. The topic was person description. The test is followed by 40 students from 42 students. The researcher did research of using Group Investigation method to improve students' reading ability at class 8C MTs Sabilul Ulum Mayong Jepara. The procedure as follow:
a. Planning

In this step the researcher prepared the learning instrument such as:

1) Lesson plan 1 about the use of group investigation method
2) Students attendance list
3) Reading material (descriptive text)
4) Observation scheme
5) Test

The teacher taught used a lesson plan as the form to implement of action. In every cycle, the teacher used different reading text. In the first, the teacher used descriptive text with the title "Alimudin, a Local Footballer"

This step, the teacher began from pre- reading activity, whilereading activity, and post-reading activity.

Pre-reading activity is the activity of students and teacher prepares themselves for the task and makes them familiar with the topic. According to William the objectives of this step are; to introduce and arouse interest in the topic, to motivate learners by giving a reason for reading, and the last to provide some language preparation for the text. ${ }^{1}$

The teacher did while-reading activity where the teacher gave clearly explanation about the material, grammatical feature, and generic structure of descriptive text. After that, the students asked to do the reading tasks in groups, each group that consists of four or five students.

The last step is post-reading activity. The post-reading activity is intended as kind of follow-up activity. In this activity the students must present the report of group work in front of class. Then the teacher gave conclusion and test.
b. Acting

In this activity, the researcher became a teacher and she was accompanied by the teacher as observer. Learning process was started by greeting, asked students to pray together, checking students' attendance and then the teacher gave brainstorming before started the material by asking the students "Do you know about descriptive text and the features of the text?" if you know, raise your hand. In this case, there some students answer the question. They were Faza Maulina, Zulfa Usna'ul Lailin, Tutik Handayani and Agus Lestari. After that, the teacher explained about descriptive text and the features of the text. The teacher introduced the topic about person description with the title "Alimudin, a Local Footballer". Then, students divided into ten groups. Each group consist of four to five people based on random system both in academically and gender. The students accepted the

[^0]text one by one, and then they read the text and identified the structure of text include the main idea, detail information, generic structure, and difficult words. Each group got the task to investigate one of person in their environment. Each group wrote name of person who investigated and the paper name of person collected to the teacher. Then, students each group found out data about person who investigated and prepared a report in form of descriptive text. After finished, the students each group presented their report in the class. During presentation, the researcher observed the students cooperative in group, the students' activeness in present the material, students concern toward other group presentation, the students' activeness in asking question, and the students' activeness in answering questions in group. Then, students helped the teacher if they faced the problem. In the last, the students and the teacher evaluated each group contribution to the work of the class. After all of the process had finished, the teacher evaluated students by giving a test. The test conducted in next day on Sunday August $8^{\text {th }} 2010$.

The last, the teacher gave suggestions to the students to study hard and also increased their vocabulary and learned grammar. Because vocabulary and grammar have role important in reading comprehension ability. Then, the teacher asked students to say hamdalah together then closed the meeting.
c. Observing

The researcher observed students in learning process at class by using observation scheme. This observation was done in learning process of using Group Investigation method to teach reading ability at the eighth grade of MTs Sabilul Ulum Mayong Jepara. It could be seen in the table below:

Table 4.1
Score of observation in the first cycle

| Group | Name of students | Aspects observed |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| I | Nailis sa'adah | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 18 |
|  | Neng Hasanah | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
|  | M. Masluri | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 11 |
|  | Miftahul Huda | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 |
| II | Zulfa Usna'ul Lailin | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
|  | A.Viki Mahrus | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 15 |
|  | Rudianto Effendi | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 14 |
|  | Eliya Indofatul | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 13 |
| III | Faza Maulina | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 19 |
|  | Setyana Andriani | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 14 |
|  | Munadi | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 14 |
|  | A. Sobirin | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
| IV | Agus Lestari | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 19 |
|  | Toni Setiawan | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 11 |
|  | Ifah Fadilah | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 12 |
|  | Wiwik Andrayani | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| V | M. Suaib | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
|  | Abdul wahid Rizki | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 14 |
|  | Maria Ulfa | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 13 |
|  | Kiki Sekarwati | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 15 |
| VI | Ana Yulianti | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 17 |
|  | Yusrul Hana | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 14 |
|  | M. Ali Warjono | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 13 |
|  | M. Fathus Syarif | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
|  | Ika Yulin Ningsih | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| VII | Kholisatul Kusniyah | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 18 |
|  | Bella Santika | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 19 |
|  | Riza Kuswahyudi | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 14 |
|  | A. Syarifudin Ridho | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 18 |
| VIII | Laila Adiyatus R. | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
|  | Yoga Nizam Prasetya | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 14 |
|  | Abdul Manaf | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
|  | Anis Fahrotun Nisa | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
| IX | Tutik Handayani | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 15 |
|  | Novi Nor Ariyanti | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 16 |
|  | Edi Hidayat | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 14 |
|  | Miftahul Hidayah | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 14 |
| X | Galuh Herawati | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 20 |
|  | Didik Wicaksono | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
|  | Ake Nuryanti N. | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 13 |


|  | Nur Cahya Dwi Susanti | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Khoirul Aziz | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 13 |
| Total | 97 | 101 | 100 | 108 | 98 | 108 | 612 |  |
| Maximum Score | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 1008 |  |
| Average Score | 2,3 | 2,4 | 2,4 | 2,57 | 2,3 | 2,57 | 14,57 |  |
| Percentage | 57,7 | 60,1 | 59,5 | 64,3 | 58,3 | 64,3 | 60,714 |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Score } & =\frac{\text { Total score }}{\text { max imal score }} \times 100 \% \\
& =\frac{612}{1008} \times 100 \% \\
& =60,71 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

According to the result of the observation above it can be concluded that the teaching learning process was sufficient learning. Although there some of students made noisy with other friends at teacher's explanation, Students did not cooperate in their group, Students did not take part in deliver the material, students did not concern toward presentation and make noisy in learning activity, students did not ask question and students did not give answer the question.
d. Reflecting

For observing the students' participation, it showed that students interested enough in learning process although they still confused with learning process using group investigation method to improve students' reading comprehension ability.

From the observation could be seen that the students still less take part in their group because the group divided randomly. So, the students still did not focus on the material; they did not listen to teacher's explanation.

Based on the notes above, the teacher as researcher must be more creative. The teacher is reflecting and evaluating the learning activities in the first cycle and tried to get solution on the problem by planning some action such as below:

1) Teacher asked students to focus on study and not make noises
2) Teacher should motivate students to be more active in their group work.
3) Teacher should manage class well.
4) Teacher made class condition well to get students be more active.
5) Teacher noted all of activities in class in learning process.
6) Teacher should motivate students to increase their vocabulary in reading comprehension ability.
The result from the reflecting could be used to make improvement. It was also used as reflecting for doing second cycle to get maximum research and repairing the third cycle if the result of the second cycle unsatisfied.

## 3. Second Cycle

This activity was done on Saturday August $21^{\text {st }}$ and Sunday August $22^{\text {nd }} 2010$. The teacher started the lesson by motivating the students and she also announced the result of yesterday's reading test. The teacher told the students score of the test was better than the pre-cycle score. In this meeting the teacher used the same method as the previous meeting and the teaching learning process ran well. The students paid attention toward teacher's explanation and they were interested with the topic on the day. They more cooperative in to do the group work and they were to be more active than previous meeting. The topic was place description. The test is followed by 42 students. The procedure as follow:
a. Planning

The researcher planned some activities to get maximum result in the second cycle. The planning of the second cycle is not far from first cycle. Such as arranged the lesson plan, attendance list, observation sheet, worksheet, and added of documenting for the second cycle. The researcher also prepared reading text that is appropriate with the material.

The teacher taught used a lesson plan as the form to implement of action. In the second cycle, the teacher used different reading text. In the first, the teacher used descriptive text with the title "Smart Health Clinic"

This step, the teacher began from pre- reading activity, whilereading activity, and post-reading activity.

Pre-reading activity is the activity of students and teacher prepare themselves for the task and make them familiar with the topic. According to William the objectives of this step are; to introduce and arouse interest in the topic, to motivate learners by giving a reason for reading, and the last to provide some language preparation for the text. ${ }^{2}$

The teacher did while-reading activity where the teacher gave clearly explanation about the material, grammatical feature, and generic structure of descriptive text. After that, the students asked to do the reading tasks in groups, each group that consists of four or five students.

The last step is post-reading activity. The post-reading activity is intended as kind of follow-up activity. In this activity the students must present the report of group work in front of class. Then the teacher gave conclusion and test.
b. Acting

The researcher did some activities such as in the first cycle. Learning process was started by greeting, asked students to pray together, checking students' attendance. Then teacher asked the students to repeat previous lesson and asked about something around the school. The teacher gave brainstorming before started the material by asking the students "Do you know this classroom and can you describe it?" if you know, raise your hand. In this case, there some

[^1]students answer the question. They were M. Miftahul Huda, Eliya Indofatul, Ana Yuliati and Galuh Herawati. After that, the teacher introduced new topic about place description with the title "Smart Health Clinic". Then, students divided into ten groups. The member of group was same with the first cycle. The students accepted the text one by one, and then they read the text and identified the structure of text include the main idea, detail information, generic structure, and difficult words. In the second cycle, the teacher prepared flashcards about places around school environment. Each group got the task to investigate one of place in their school environment. Students' representative from every group came forward in class to choose one flashcard. Then, students each group found out data about place based on flashcard and prepared a report in form of descriptive text. After finished, the students each group presented their report in the class. During presentation, the researcher observed the students cooperative in group, the students' activeness in present the material, students concern toward other group presentation, the students' activeness in asking question, and the students' activeness in answering questions in group. Then, students helped the teacher if they faced the problem. In the last, the students and the teacher evaluated each group contribution to the work of the class. After all of the process had finished, the teacher evaluated students by giving a test. The test conducted in next day on Sunday August $22^{\text {nd }} 2010$.

The last, the teacher gave suggestions to the students to study hard and also increased their vocabulary and learned grammar. Because vocabulary and grammar have role important in reading comprehension ability. Then, the teacher asked students to say hamdalah together then closed the meeting.
c. Observing

The observer observed students in learning process at class by using observation checklist like at the first cycle. It could be seen in the table below:

Table 4.2
Score of observation in the second cycle

| Group | Name of students |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| I | Nailis Sa'adah | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 19 |
|  | Neng Hasanah | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 19 |
|  | M.Masluri | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 18 |
|  | Miftahul Huda | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
| II | Zulfa Usnau' | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
|  | A. Viki Mahrus | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 18 |
|  | Rudianto Effendi | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
|  | Eliya Indofatul | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 16 |
| III | Faza Maulina | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 20 |
|  | Setyana Andriani | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
|  | Munadi | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
|  | A. Sobirin | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 17 |
| IV | Agus Lestari | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 21 |
|  | Toni Setiawan | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
|  | Ifah fadilah | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 14 |
|  | Wiwik Andrayani | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 16 |
| V | M. Suaib | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
|  | Abdul Wahid Rizki | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 18 |
|  | Maria Ulfa | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 14 |
|  | Kiki Sekarwati | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 16 |
| VI | Ana Yulianti | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 20 |
|  | Yusrul Hana | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
|  | M. Ali Warjono | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 16 |
|  | M. Fathus Syarif | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 16 |
|  | Ika Yulin Ningsih | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 14 |
| VII | Kholisatul Kusniyah | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 19 |
|  | Bella Santika | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 20 |
|  | Riza Kuswahyudi | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
|  | A. Syarifudin Ridho | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
| VIII | Laila Adiyatus R. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 19 |
|  | Yoga Nizam Prasetya | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
|  | Abdul Manaf | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 14 |


|  | Anis Fahrotun Nisa | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 15 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IX | Tutik Handayani | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 19 |
|  | Novi Nor Ariyanti | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 16 |
|  | Edi Hidayat | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
|  | Miftahul Hidayah | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 16 |
| X | Galuh Herawati | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
|  | Didik Wicaksono | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
|  | Ake Nuryanti N. | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 15 |
|  | Nur Cahya Dwi Susanti | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 14 |
|  | Khoirul Aziz | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 17 |
| $\quad$ Total | 110 | 122 | 118 | 121 | 110 | 125 | 707 |  |
| $\quad$ Maximum Score | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 168 | 1008 |  |
| $\quad$ Average Score | 2,6 | 2,9 | 2,8 | 2,9 | 2,6 | 2,98 | 16,83 |  |
| $\quad$ Percentage | 65,5 | 72,6 | 70,2 | 72 | 65,5 | 74,4 | 70,14 |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Score } & =\frac{\text { Total score }}{\text { max imal score }} \times 100 \% \\
& =\frac{707}{1008} \times 100 \% \\
& =70,14 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

According to the result of the observation above, it can be concluded that the majority of the students joined the class enthusiastically. All activities in the second cycle could run well. It can be seen from their responses. The students paid attention toward teacher's explanation. They more cooperative in to do the group work and they were to be more active than previous meeting. They took active in answering question although helped by the teacher.
d. Reflecting

The result of the second cycle was also considered as implementation. It was better than previous one. There was an improvement in this cycle. The condition of the class was getting better. The students listen to the teacher's explanation and did not make noisy in learning activity. The students took active part in cooperation and can associate with member group. It was because they
are interesting to study with Group Investigation method that the teacher never uses it as teaching method before

The researcher concluded that the problems have been solving using Group Investigation method to teaching English reading ability. The teacher should motivate students to always reading a lot in English text and motivate the passive students in order to be brave to express their idea.

In this study, the researcher also used interview as supporting data; it was about the responses of the teacher and the students toward the use of Group Investigation method in teaching process. It was conducted on Sunday August $22^{\text {nd }} 2010$ in the end of second cycle. Firstly, the researcher interviewed the students and then the teacher. The researcher asked five questions to the students and the teacher about their responses of using Group Investigation method in teaching process.

All of the students had positive responses toward the teaching activity by using Group Investigation method. They felt enjoy when they were taught using GI, because could help the students to introduce with other friend who have different background both in academically and gender. So, they could work together. Most of students also said that they were any improvement in reading ability after the teaching learning process with GI.

After the interview had finished, the researcher found that most of the students had positive responses toward the teaching activity and it was supported by the increase of the students' average that could be seen in the result of the second cycle.

It proved that the use of Group Investigation method could motivate the students' interest in learning English and improve students' reading ability. Through this method not only helped students improve their reading ability but also helped them to introduce with other friends both in academically and gender.

## B. The findings of research

After the researcher implemented the use of group investigation method to improve students' reading ability, the researcher got the data. It was analyzed of pre-cycle and two cycles the researcher got the result of classroom action research.

## 1. Pre-cycle

The pre-cycle was conducted on Sunday, August $1^{\text {st }}$ 2010. In this meeting the teacher was doing teaching learning process as usual that is the teacher used reading aloud method.
a. Measuring the students individual improvement

After conducting the test, the researcher gave score. Each correct answer was scored 1 and 0 to each wrong answer. The maximum score was 100 .

After finding the research of students test score in reading class, the researcher went to further analysis by using percentage of scoring as follow:

$$
\text { Score }=\frac{\text { The number of right answer }}{\text { The number of question }} \times 100 \%
$$

The test result of pre-cycle can be seen in the table below.
Table 4.3
The test result of pre-cycle

| No | Students code | Score | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | C-1 | 50 | $50 \%$ |
| 2 | C-2 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 3 | C-3 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 4 | C-4 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 5 | C-5 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 6 | C-6 | 50 | $50 \%$ |
| 7 | C-7 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 8 | C-8 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 9 | C-9 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 10 | C-10 | 55 | $55 \%$ |


| 11 | C-11 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12 | C-12 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 13 | C-13 | 50 | $50 \%$ |
| 14 | C-14 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 15 | C-15 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 16 | C-16 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 17 | C-17 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 18 | C-18 | Absent | Absent |
| 19 | C-19 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 20 | C-20 | 50 | $50 \%$ |
| 21 | C-21 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 22 | C-22 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 23 | C-23 | 50 | $50 \%$ |
| 24 | C-24 | 45 | $45 \%$ |
| 25 | C-25 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 26 | C-26 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 27 | C-27 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 28 | C-28 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 29 | C-29 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 30 | C-30 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 31 | C-31 | 45 | $45 \%$ |
| 32 | C-32 | 50 | $50 \%$ |
| 33 | C-33 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 34 | C-34 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 35 | C-35 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 36 | C-36 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 37 | C-37 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 38 | C-38 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 39 | C-39 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 40 | C-40 | 45 | $45 \%$ |
| 41 | C-41 | 50 | $50 \%$ |
| 42 | C-42 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
|  | M | 2425 |  |
|  | F | -65 |  |

From the result of pre-cycle showed that many of students still low in their reading comprehension ability. From 42 students, 1 student get 80 and 3 students get 75 or good mark, 3 students get 70, 6 students get 65 , and 9 students get 60 or fair mark, 9 students get 55,7 students get 50,3 students get 45 or less mark and 1 student was absent.
b. Measuring mean

The mean score of reading class can be searched by using this following formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{X} & =\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{X}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
\bar{X} & =\frac{2425}{42} \\
& =57.73
\end{aligned}
$$

The average achievement of students in the pre-cycle was 57.73. The result of pre-cycle was lower than the criterion that has been stipulated by KKM (Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal/ Minium Passing Grade Criteria). The researcher concluded that the treatment in each cycle was necessary to improve students' reading comprehension ability result.

## 2. Cycle 1

The first cycle was conducted on Saturday August $7^{\text {th }}$ and Sunday August $8^{\text {th }} 2010$. It was held 07.40-09.00 am and $07.40-$ 08.20 am . In the first cycle the teacher taught reading using group investigation method. There were some obstacles in apply this method, it was made class noisy and some students did not join with other.
a. Measuring the students individual improvement

After conducting the test, the researcher gave score. Each correct answer was scored 1 and 0 to each wrong answer. The maximum score was 100 .

After finding the research of students test score in reading class, the researcher went to further analysis by using percentage of scoring as follow:

$$
\text { Score }=\frac{\text { The number of right answer }}{\text { The number of question }} \times 100 \%
$$

The test result of cycle 1 can be seen in the table below.
Table 4.4
The test result of cycle 1

| No | Students code | Score | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | C-1 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 2 | C-2 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 3 | C-3 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 4 | C-4 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 5 | C-5 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 6 | C-6 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 7 | C-7 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 8 | C-8 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 9 | C-9 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 10 | C-10 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 11 | C-11 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 12 | C-12 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 13 | C-13 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 14 | C-14 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 15 | C-15 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 16 | C-16 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 17 | C-17 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 18 | C-18 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 19 | C-19 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 20 | C-20 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 21 | C-21 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 22 | C-22 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 23 | C-23 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 24 | C-24 | Absent | Absent |
| 25 | C-25 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 26 | C-26 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 27 | C-27 | 85 | $85 \%$ |
| 28 | C-28 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 29 | C-29 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 30 | C-30 | 90 | $90 \%$ |
| 31 | C-31 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 32 | C-32 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 33 | C-33 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 34 | C-34 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 35 | C-35 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 36 | C-36 | Absent | Absent |
| 37 | C-37 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
| 38 | C-38 | 60 | $60 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| 39 | C-39 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 40 | C-40 | 55 | $55 \%$ |
| 41 | C-41 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 42 | C-42 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
|  | M | 2690 |  |

b. Measuring mean

The mean score of reading class can be searched by using this following formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{X} & =\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{X}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
\bar{X} & =\frac{2690}{42} \\
& =64.05
\end{aligned}
$$

The average achievement of students in the cycle 1 was 64 . 05. It means the students score in the first cycle can be categorized as fair. The researcher concluded that the treatment in cycle 1 was necessary to improve students' reading comprehension ability. Because there were two students absent and two students test score still unsatisfied yet, so the researcher could continue to the next cycle.

## 3. Cycle 2

The second cycle was conducted on Saturday August $21^{\text {st }}$ and Sunday August $22^{\text {nd }} 2010$. It was held $07.40-09.00$ am and $07.40-$ 08.20 am . In the second cycle the teacher taught reading using the same method as previous meeting that is group investigation method. This activity makes the students enjoy the lesson more than before. They worked in their groups and did their roles better than before.
a. Measuring the students individual improvement

After conducting the test, the researcher gave score. Each correct answer was scored 1 and 0 to each wrong answer. The maximum score was 100 .

After finding the research of students test score in reading class, the researcher went to further analysis by using percentage of scoring as follow:

$$
\text { Score }=\frac{\text { The number of right answer }}{\text { The number of question }} \times 100 \%
$$

The test result of cycle 2 can be seen in the table below.
Table 4.5

## The test result of cycle 2

| No | Students code | Score | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | C-1 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 2 | C-2 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 3 | C-3 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 4 | C-4 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 5 | C-5 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 6 | C-6 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 7 | C-7 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 8 | C-8 | 85 | $85 \%$ |
| 9 | C-9 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 10 | C-10 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 11 | C-11 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 12 | C-12 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 13 | C-13 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 14 | C-14 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 15 | C-15 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 16 | C-16 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 17 | C-17 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 18 | C-18 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 19 | C-19 | 90 | $90 \%$ |
| 20 | C-20 | 85 | $85 \%$ |
| 21 | C-21 | 90 | $90 \%$ |
| 22 | C-22 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 23 | C-23 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 24 | C-24 | 75 | $75 \%$ |


| 25 | C-25 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | C-26 | 85 | $85 \%$ |
| 27 | C-27 | 85 | $85 \%$ |
| 28 | C-28 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 29 | C-29 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 30 | C-30 | 85 | $85 \%$ |
| 31 | C-31 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 32 | C-32 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 33 | C-33 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 34 | C-34 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 35 | C-35 | 65 | $65 \%$ |
| 36 | C-36 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 37 | C-37 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 38 | C-38 | 80 | $80 \%$ |
| 39 | C-39 | 75 | $75 \%$ |
| 40 | C-40 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 41 | C-41 | 70 | $70 \%$ |
| 42 | C-42 | 90 | $90 \%$ |
|  | M | 3160 |  |

b. Measuring mean

The mean score of reading class can be searched by using this following formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{X} & =\frac{\Sigma \mathrm{X}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\
\bar{X} & =\frac{3160}{42} \\
& =75.23
\end{aligned}
$$

The average achievement of students in the last cycle was 75.23 or very good mark. It can be said the second cycle was successful since the result was better than in the pre-cycle and in the first cycle. The researcher concluded that there is improvement students' reading comprehension ability from pre-cycle until cycle 2.

The result of the test from the pre-cycle until second cycle briefly can be seen in table 4 below.

Table 4.6
The tests result from the pre-cycle until the second cycle

| No | Students <br> code | Pre <br> cycle | Cycle 1 | Cycle 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | C-1 | 50 | 60 | 70 |
| 2 | C-2 | 60 | 60 | 75 |
| 3 | C-3 | 55 | 65 | 70 |
| 4 | C-4 | 70 | 80 | 80 |
| 5 | C-5 | 55 | 70 | 75 |
| 6 | C-6 | 50 | 70 | 80 |
| 7 | C- | 65 | 65 | 70 |
| 8 | C-8 | 65 | 70 | 85 |
| 9 | C-9 | 60 | 65 | 70 |
| 10 | C-10 | 55 | 60 | 75 |
| 11 | C-11 | 55 | 65 | 65 |
| 12 | C-12 | 60 | 70 | 70 |
| 13 | C-13 | 50 | 65 | 70 |
| 14 | C-14 | 80 | 80 | 75 |
| 15 | C-15 | 65 | 65 | 65 |
| 16 | C-16 | 60 | 70 | 80 |
| 17 | C-17 | 60 | 75 | 70 |
| 18 | C-18 | Absent | 60 | 70 |
| 19 | C-19 | 75 | 70 | 90 |
| 20 | C-20 | 50 | 60 | 85 |
| 21 | C-21 | 75 | 75 | 90 |
| 22 | C-22 | 65 | 60 | 70 |
| 23 | C-23 | 50 | 65 | 75 |
| 24 | C-24 | 45 | Absent | 75 |
| 25 | C-25 | 60 | 60 | 65 |
| 26 | C-26 | 70 | 70 | 85 |
| 27 | C-27 | 65 | 85 | 85 |
| 28 | C-28 | 60 | 65 | 70 |
| 29 | C-29 | 55 | 65 | 70 |
| 30 | C-30 | 75 | 90 | 85 |
| 31 | C-31 | 45 | 55 | 75 |
| 32 | C-32 | 50 | 70 | 75 |
| 33 | C-33 | 55 | 60 | 70 |
| 34 | C-34 | 60 | 65 | 80 |
| 35 | C-35 | 55 | 70 | 65 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| 36 | C-36 | 55 | Absent | 70 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 37 | C-37 | 55 | 60 | 80 |
| 38 | C-38 | 65 | 60 | 80 |
| 39 | C-39 | 60 | 70 | 75 |
| 40 | C-40 | 45 | 55 | 70 |
| 41 | C-41 | 50 | 65 | 70 |
| 42 | C-42 | 75 | 80 | 90 |
| Sum |  | 2425 | 2690 | 3160 |
| Mean |  | 57.73 | 64.05 | 75.23 |
| Low <br> score |  | 45 | 55 | 65 |
| High <br> score |  | 80 | 90 | 90 |

The following is the chart of the test during the Classroom Action Research;

Table 4.7


From the table 6 above, the use of group investigation method to improve students' reading ability can help students to understand and comprehension the reading material. So, in this classroom action research of the implementation of group investigation method to improve students' reading ability in descriptive text at MTs Sabilul Ulum Mayong Jepara was success. It can be seen from the result of each cycle show any improvement not only in teaching learning activity but also the result of test.

## C. Limitation of This Study

1. This study is only limited in VIII C students of MTs Sabilul Ulum Mayong Jepara.
2. The use of group investigation (GI) method in this study is only to measure students' reading ability both lexical and grammatical.

[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Grabe William and Fedricka L. Stoller, Teaching and Researching Reading, (Great Britanian: Pearson Education, 2002), p. 38

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Grabe William and Fedricka L. Stoller, Teaching and Researching Reading, (Great Britanian: Pearson Education, 2002), p. 38

