



Improving Reading Comprehension and Writing Achievements of the Eighth Grade Students Through Generating Interaction Between Schemata and Text (GIST) Strategy

Khoirunnisa¹; M. Arif Rahman Hakim²

¹ MAN 2 Lubuk Linggau, Sumatera Selatan, Indonesia

² UIN Fatmawati Sukarno Bengkulu, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v10i11.5256>

Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of (Generating Interaction between schemata and Text) GIST strategy in enhancing the students' achievement in reading comprehension and writing. This study applied quasi-experimental method with nonequivalent pretest-posttest groups' design. Forty two students were selected as the sample. They were divided equally into experimental and control groups. Reading and writing tests were used to collect the data. Paired and independent sample t-test, and linear regression were applied to analyze the data. The result showed that GIST strategy improves the students' achievement in most aspects of reading comprehension and writing. However, GIST strategy does not give the significant improvement to the students' achievement in inference aspect of reading comprehension and developing ideas aspect of writing. It implies that English teacher should use the strategy more carefully to improve all the aspects of reading comprehension and writing, especially the inference aspect of reading and the developing ideas aspect of writing.

Keywords: *Reading Comprehension; Writing Achievement; GIST Strategy*

Introduction

Reading and writing are two of language skills that the students need to master because those skills are important in learning. Shanahan et al. (2010, p. 5) state that reading comprehension is an extracting and constructing meaning process through interaction between the reader and the text. Extracting meaning is to comprehend what the author has stated explicitly or implicitly. Constructing meaning is to interpret what the author has said by bringing one's "capacities, abilities, knowledge, and experiences" to comprehend what is read. According to Jozsef (2001), writing is the most complex human activity. It involves the development of a design idea, knowledge, and experience with subjects.

Reading and writing give much contribution to students' success in learning process. Lems et al (2009) state that there are five reasons why reading in English is important. First, reading in English helps the readers learn to think in English. Second, reading in English helps the readers to improve their English

vocabulary. Third, reading in English helps the readers to improve their writing skill in English. Fourth, reading in English may be the only way for the readers to use English if they live in a non-English-speaking country. It can be said that reading is important because it can give valuable information to the readers. Meanwhile, Graham and Perin (2007, p. 3) state that writing is an essential skill that has to be possessed by the students because it is an academic success predictor and basic requirement for participant in social and global life. In short, reading and writing are important skills that can be keys to success for the students. It is not only for university but also for junior high school. Besides that, reading and writing have close relation. Bazerman (2010) found out that reading can help the students to develop their writing and revise their own writing to be a purposeful and appropriate.

In the demand of Sustainable Development Goals, all people in the world, both men and women, achieve literacy and numeracy by 2030 (United Nation, 2015). It means that to achieve the goal, all people should master the basic skill such as reading and writing. It is also supported by Ministry of Education and culture (2014) states that in the 2013 curriculum, reading and writing skills are important to master by students. In the core competence is stated that the students should master writing, reading, counting, drawing, and composing in accordance with the subject learned in school and other sources in the same viewpoint or theory.

Unfortunately, Indonesia still has many illiterate people. It is proved by some studies found out that there are many illiterate people both younger and older generation in Indonesia (World Literacy Foundation, 2015; United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 2015; United Nations Development Programs (UNDP), 2013; Ministry of Education and Culture, 2012). Additionally, the reading ability of Indonesian students is low both in Indonesian language and English. It is proved by some studies found out that the students' reading level in Indonesia got the lower rank than other countries (Programme Internationale for Students Assesment (PISA), 2016; Education First, 2015; Educational Testing Service (ETS), 2015). Meanwhile, in local level, South Sumatra also got the low level in writing. Marbiah (2012) found that the mean score of writing achievement of the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri Lubuklinggau is 53 for pre-test in experimental group and 67.70 for post-test in experimental group. It means that the students' writing mean score of MTs Negeri Lubuklinggau still got below of the standard score (KKM), although they had got special treatment. The standard score (KKM) is 70.

The role of the teacher as the facilitator in teaching learning process is very important to solve this problem. According to Guthrie, Wigfield, and Perencevich (2004, p.10) "using a strategy helps students build interlinked knowledge that is taught". Therefore, the teachers should select good strategy for students with particular purposes (Zubaedi et al, 2020; Hakim et al, 2022) . The selection strategy should primarily depend on the students' need. One of the strategies in teaching reading and writing are GIST strategy. GIST strategy stands for Generating Interaction between schemata and text.

According to Smith et al (2021), schema theory is an explanation of how readers use the background knowledge to comprehend a text. The readers use their schemata to comprehend a text. Buehl (2023) state that the background knowledge of the reader helps to structure the interpretation of new messages about a topic. It means that background knowledge has the important role in reading process. Meanwhile, an (2013) found that schemata can help to guide students in comprehending a text from the global point of view. Furthermore, Stevens et al (2020) state that GIST is a strategy that can increase students' ability to predict the message by using their prior knowledge during reading a text.

McKnight (2010, p. 120) states that GIST strategy is useful strategy for summarizing and getting the main idea of a text. By using summary, the students will be trained how to get the main idea of a text and how to restate the most important point or idea of paragraph. This strategy fosters comprehension by having students condense or summarize longer texts, allowing students to put concepts into their own words. Meanwhile, Khoshima and Nia (2014, p. 266) found that summarizing is a skill that enhances

students' writing and comprehension because it requires reprocessing information in a written text and requires expressing that information in their own words to reconstruct the meaning in a condensed form. Additionally, Dromsky (2011) and Braxton (2009) found that GIST strategy is an effective strategy to improve the students' ability in reading and summarizing.

Therefore, the objectives of this study were: (1) to find out whether or not there were the significant improvement in reading comprehension and writing achievements of the eighth grade students after they were taught by using GIST strategy. (2) to find out whether or not there were the significant difference in reading comprehension and writing achievements between the eighth grade students who were taught by using GIST strategy and those who were not taught by using GIST strategy. (4) to find out whether or not there were the significant contribution of reading aspects to reading comprehension achievement and writing aspects to writing achievement of the eighth grade students after they were taught by using GIST strategy.

Methodology

This study was conducted by using quasi-experimental method and the research design was nonequivalent pretest-posttest groups' design. In this study, purposive sampling was used to get a sample. The sample is selected based on some criteria: (1) the students are taught by the same teacher, (2) the students were not taking an English course during the study, and (3) the students were from four levels; level 1, 2, 3, and 4 based on the IRI (Informal Reading Inventory) test given by the writer provided by Stark (1981). The total was 42 students. After that, the writer divided them into two groups, 21 students for experimental group and 21 students for control group. This study used GIST strategy to teach the experimental group. GIST strategy is introduced by Cunningham in 1982 (McKnight, 2010, p.120). The teaching procedures were as follows: (1) the teacher asked the students some questions related to the text, (2) the students previewed the reading text, (3) the teacher wrote twenty word-side blank on the whiteboard, (4) The students and teacher made a summary of the first paragraph in twenty words or less on the whiteboard, (5) the teacher and the students discussed the difficult words in the text, (6) the students worked into a group that contained of four students in one group, (7) the students read the second paragraph in the group, (8) the students closed the text and made the summary of the second paragraph in twenty words or less in group, (9) the students read the paragraph again to make sure that they get the complete information, (10) the students did the same activities until the last paragraph, (11) the writer and the students discussed the summary and revised the summary, (12) the students presented the summary in front of the class.

The students got the tests about reading comprehension and writing in pre-test and post-test to collect the data. Reading comprehension test consisted of 35 multiple choice questions. Those 35 questions covered some aspects of reading (main idea, detail, sequence, cause and effect, inference, vocabulary, and reference). Before the reading comprehension test was administered to the participants, the test was firstly tried out to 30 eighth graders of Junior High School (SMP Negeri) 2 Lubuklinggau city. The reliability of the test was computed using Cronbach Alpha and the validity of the test was also analyzed statistically through the analysis of discrimination index and difficulty level (Kumar et al, 2021). It was found that the reliability coefficient of the test was 0.894 meaning that the test items were internally reliable. Additionally, the analysis of difficulty level and discrimination index showed that the test items were mostly in moderate level and good discrimination index.

Meanwhile, for writing test, to find out the validity of the writing test, the content of the writing test has been adjusted to the teaching materials based on the curriculum and the syllabus used for the eighth grade students as the sample of the study. After that, the writer asked two expert judgments to see the appropriateness. To assess students' writing, the writer used two raters. The raters used the same

writing rubric. The raters are chosen based on two criteria: a graduate of strata 2 from the English Study program; having more than 5 year teaching experience.

Furthermore, to see whether there were significant difference in students' reading comprehension and writing achievements both in pretest and posttest, the data were analyzed using paired sample t-test. The writer analyzed the data statistically by applying independent sample t-test to find significant difference in students' reading comprehension and writing achievements between the experimental and control groups (Agustina, 2020). Meanwhile, the writer used stepwise regression analysis to find out whether or not there was any significant contribution of reading aspects to reading comprehension achievement and writing aspects to writing achievement of the students after being taught by using GIST strategy.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The score distribution of students' reading and writing in the posttest of the experimental and control groups is presented in Table 1. It shows five levels of achievements (very good, good, average, poor, and very poor) with 0 to 100 score range for reading and writing.

Table 1. The Score Distribution of Reading Comprehension and Writing Based on Posttest Score (N=42)

Skill	Score Interval	Level of Achievements	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Reading Comprehension	86-100	Very good	2	4.8	85.71	0.000
	71-85	Good	9	21.5	74.29	4.04023
	56-70	Average	25	59.4	64.23	3.41196
	41-55	Poor	6	14.3	53.34	1.47690
	≥40	Very poor	0	0	0	0
	Total		42	100		
Writing	86-100	Very good	0	0	0	0
	71-85	Good	3	7.4	76.00	2.0000
	56-70	Average	20	46.7	61.70	4.55493
	41-55	Poor	19	45.9	47.68	3.48094
	≥40	Very poor	0	0	0	0
	Total		42	100		

Based on the score categorization, there were 6 students (14.3%) in poor category, 25 students (59.4%) in average category, 9 students (21.5%) in good category, and 2 students (4.8%) in very good category of reading comprehension achievement. Besides that, in writing posttest both in the experimental and control group, there were 19 students (45.9%) in poor category, 20 students (46.7%) in average category, and 3 students (7.4%) in good category.

Statistical Analyses

In conducting this study, the data were analyzed statistically through (1) paired sample t-test, (2) independent t-test, (3) regression analysis. The results of paired and independent sample t-test for reading comprehension are in Table 2.

Table 2. The Results of Paired and Independent Sample t-test of Reading Comprehension Achievement and Its Aspects

Variables	Paired Sample t-Test							Independent Sample t-Test			
	Experimental			t/ Sig.	Control			t/ Sig.	t/sig of gain		
	Mean Pre	Mean Post	Mean diff		Mean Pre	Mean Post	Mean diff				
Total of reading achievement	53.83	71.30	17.47	12,260 0.000	54.15	61.73	7.58	6.595 0.000	9.5696 0.000	4.473 0.000	5.350 0.000
Main idea	44.76	81.90	37.14	13.000 0.000	45.71	60.95	15.24	5.587 0.000	20.952	4.957 0.000	5.546 0.000
Sequence	57.14	67.62	10.48	3.532 0.002	54.29	62.86	8.57	2.631 0.016	4.712	1.238 0.223	0.432 0.668
Detail	60.00	76.19	16.19	4.949 0.000	59.05	66.67	7.62	2.359 0.029	9.524	2.828 0.007	1.865 0.070
Vocabulary	42.06	60.31	18.25	7.167 0.000	42.86	52.38	9.52	4.382 0.000	7.937	2.331 0.025	2.607 0.013
Inference	60.95	62.85	1.90	1.451 0.162	51.43	52.38	0.95	0.4391 0.666	10.476	2.919 0.006	0.375 0.709
Cause-Effect	47.62	65.71	18.09	5.920 0.000	59.05	61.90	2.85	0.900 0.379	3.664	1.040 0.305	3.459 0.001
Reference	64.28	84.52	20.24	4.949 0.000	66.67	75.00	8.33	3.162 0.005	4.307	2.359 0.023	2.447 0.019

Based on Table 2 below, the result of paired sample t-test showed that there was a significant improvement in the students' reading comprehension after the treatment was given. In the aspect of reading, main idea got the highest improvement. Meanwhile, inference did not have any improvement. Meanwhile, to know the significant difference between students in the experimental and control group, the writer used independent sample t-test in SPSS 22. There was a significant difference of posttest score between experimental and control group when the significance value < the alpha value (0.05). The significance value of students' reading comprehension was 0.000. This result showed that there was a significant difference of students' reading comprehension because the significance value was lower than alpha (0.05).

Furthermore, from the result of t-value of gain between experimental and control group, it was found that t-value of gain was 5.350 with the significance value 0.000, t-value of main idea was 5.546 with the significance value 0.000, t-value of sequence was 0.432 with the significance value 0.668, t-value of detail was 1.865 with the significance value 0.070, t-value of vocabulary was 2.607 with the significance value 0.013, t-value of inference was 0.375 with the significance value 0.709, cause effect was 3.459 with the significance 0.001, and t-value of reference was 2.447 with the significance value 0.019. Some results confirm that the students in the experimental group made better improvement in reading achievement compared to those of students in the control group.

Furthermore, paired sample t-test is also used to analyze the significant improvement of students' writing pretest to posttest in both group and each aspect. Meanwhile, the significance difference of students' writing pretest and posttest in both groups was analyzed by using independent sample t-test. The results are in Table 3.

Table 3. The Results of Paired and Independent Sample t-test of Writing Achievement and Its Aspects

Variables	Paired Sample t-Test								Independent Sample t-Test		
	Experimental				Control				Mean diff	t/ Sig.	t/sig of gain
	Mean Pre	Mean Post	Mean diff	t/ Sig.	Mean Pre	Mean Post	Mean diff	t/ Sig.			
Total of writing achievement	46.09	62.47	16.38	12.903 0.000	46.66	50.28	3.62	6.858 0.000	12.190	5.305 0.000	9.282 0.000
Developing Idea	53.33	55.71	2.38	1.746 0.096	51.90	52.38	0.47	0.568 0.576	3.333	1.270 0.212	1.190 0.241
Organization	50.00	63.81	13.81	6.501 0.000	49.05	53.81	4.76	2.911 0.009	10.000	3.420 0.001	3.375 0.002
Grammar	48.09	72.38	24.29	8.919 0.000	43.33	49.52	6.19	3.525 0.002	22.857	6.708 0.000	5.585 0.000
Vocabulary	40.00	60.47	20.47	9.639 0.000	42.38	51.43	9.05	5.396 0.000	9.048	3.302 0.002	4.223 0.000
Mechanics	39.04	60.00	20.96	7.613 0.000	46.67	44.28	-2.38	-1.096 0.286	15.714	5.147 0.000	6.656 0.000

Table 3 shows that there was a significant improvement in students' writing achievements in experimental group. The result of paired sample t-test in experimental group showed that t-value of writing was 12.903 with the significance value 0.000. In addition, there was significant improvement in students' writing achievement in control group the significance value 0.000. Moreover, the results of independent sample t-test in posttest after the treatment showed that t-value was 5.305 and the significance value was lower than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that there was significant difference between experimental and control groups. However, one aspect namely, developing idea didn't show significant difference between these two groups. Likewise, other four writing aspects showed significant difference.

Furthermore, from the result of t-value between the experimental and control groups, it was found that t-value of gain was 9.282 with the significance value 0.000, t-value of developing idea was 1.190 with the significance value 0.241, t-value of organization was 3.375 with the significance value 0.002. Then, t-value of grammar was 5.585 with the significance value 0.000. Next, t-value of vocabulary was 4.223 with the significance value 0.000. The last t-value of mechanic was 6.656 with the significance value 0.000. The result confirm that the students in the experimental group made better improvement in writing achievement compared to those of students in the control group. However, developing idea aspect did not show the difference between experimental and control group, since the significance value was higher than 0.05.

Since there was a significant improvement in students' reading comprehension and writing achievements after they were taught by using GIST strategy, multiple regression analysis was used to know which aspects contributed the most to the total reading comprehension and writing achievements. The result of the analysis is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Contributions of Aspects of Reading and Writing toward Reading and Writing Achievements

Independent Variable	R	R ²	Change Statistics	
			R ² Change	Sig. F Change
Reading				
Vocabulary	0.704	0.496	0.496	0.000
V, Detail	0.861	0.741	0.245	0.001
V, D, Reference	0.950	0.903	0.163	0.000
V, D, R, Sequence	0.967	0.936	0.033	0.011

V, D, R, S, Inference	0.980	0.961	0.025	0.000
V, D, R, S, I, Cause Effect	0.988	0.985	0.024	0.010
V, D, R, S, I, C, Main Idea	1.000	1.000	0.016	0.010
Writing				
Organization	0.896	0.803	0.803	0.000
O, Grammar	0.944	0.891	0.087	0.001
O, G, Mechanic	0.967	0.934	0.044	0.004
O, G, M, Developing idea	0.985	0.970	0.036	0.000
O, G, M, DI, Vocabulary	1.000	1.000	0.030	0.000

Table 4 shows that all aspects of reading comprehension contributed to the reading comprehension achievement of the experimental group after they were taught by using GIST strategy. Vocabulary gave contribution 49.6%, followed by detail 24.5%, reference 16.3%, sequence 3.3%, inference 2.5%, cause effect 2.4%, and main idea 1.6%. All the aspects of writing gave contribution to students' writing achievement in experimental group. Organization contributed 80.3%, followed by grammar 8.7%, mechanic 4.4%, developing idea 3.6%, and vocabulary 3%.

Discussion

Based on the findings of this study, some interpretation can be drawn. First, there were 9 students in good category and 2 students in very good category. However, there were 6 students in poor category. It is probably because the students lack of vocabulary. It could be seen from the result of posttest in experiment and control groups showed that the students got the lowest mean score in vocabulary aspect. Vocabulary is important in comprehending a text. Broomley (2004, p. 3) states that vocabulary knowledge supports reading fluency, enhances academic achievement, and improves reading comprehension. In terms of writing, there were 3 students in good category and most of students in average score. Therefore, there were 19 students in poor category. It might be because most of students have difficulty in developing ideas aspect. It could be seen from the result of posttest in experimental and control groups showed that the students got the lowest mean score in developing ideas aspect. It needs longer time to make the students have a good skill to develop the ideas in writing. Alfaki (2015) found out that English language students of Nile Valley University face problems of developing and organizing ideas. Therefore, it is not surprising if the eighth grade students have difficulty in developing ideas aspect.

Second, the result of paired sample t-test in reading comprehension showed that GIST strategy was an appropriate strategy to teach reading comprehension skill. It is likely that this strategy requires the students to make a summary of a text that lead them to have better understanding about the text. In this study, this strategy helped the students to have a better comprehension in reading through summary. The students have the opportunities to work cooperatively with their friends, stimuli students' creativity, stimuli students' background knowledge, give the chance to share the idea so that GIST facilitates students to develop students' reading comprehension. Johari et al. (2013) also found that summarizing has helped the students to analyze a text and identify the important information and main idea of a text. The English teachers not only teach how to read a text, but also how to understand the text. Thus, GIST Strategy helped the students to gain significant improvement in their reading comprehension. It is supported by the similar results of previous related study that showed the significant improvement in reading comprehension achievement of the eleventh graders of SMA Dwijendra Bualu (Puspayani, 2012). In addition, Schuder et al. (1989, p. 232) state that GIST strategy can improve the students' ability to predict the message by using their prior knowledge during reading a text. GIST strategy activates the students' schemata, so that the students' knowledge and previous experience will help the students to understand a text. Therefore, it is considered as a helpful strategy in teaching reading.

Third, some aspects of reading comprehension (main idea, sequence, detail, vocabulary, cause effect, and reference) got significant improvement after the students were given the treatment. The main idea aspect got the highest improvement in reading comprehension because the GIST strategy provides many opportunities for the students to do summaries. This opportunity makes the students familiar with how to get the main idea of a text. The students work in small groups to discuss the main idea of the text. The discussion encourages the students to share ideas how to make a good summary. Yerger (2012, p. 853) states that GIST is a useful strategy to get the main idea of a text and to learn how to summarize. Meanwhile, inference did not get the improvement in the students' reading comprehension. It was probably caused by the fact that inference is the most difficult reading comprehension aspect. To understand the inference value, the students need higher thinking skill in order to understand the implied meaning in a text. It is supported by the similar results of previous related study by Zuhra (2015) which found out that the most difficult reading comprehension question type faced by students was the inference type. In Zuhra's study, the sample was the 12th grade students of one of senior high schools in Lhokseumawe. The 12th grade students still got difficult to comprehend the inference. Therefore, it is not surprising if the eighth grade students still have difficulty to understand the inference aspect. Besides that, in the process of teaching and learning, the writer gave small portion of inference activities so that the students were not familiar how to understand the inference aspect. The students learnt about the inference aspect when they answered the questions. Every meeting, the writer only provided one question about inference aspect. The students need more exercises about the inference aspect in order to make the students familiar how to understand the implied meaning.

Furthermore, based on the result of paired sample t-test in writing achievement, there was significant improvement of the students' writing achievement after they were taught by using GIST strategy. The improvement can be seen from the mean score in the experimental group after given the treatments. In other words, GIST strategy was taught by the writer to the experimental group for 30 meetings worked well to improve the students' writing achievement. It is likely that in the learning process, the students read a descriptive text before wrote a descriptive text. Through reading, the students could understand what should consist in a good descriptive text. Then the students wrote a summary. The process of summary trained the students how to make a good sentence because they write the summary by using their own words. The results of the reading and summary process give the effect to the students' understanding how to make a good writing text. This is supported by another previous study which showed the significant difference in students' writing achievement when the students were taught by using GIST Strategy (Braxton, 2009).

Fifth, some aspects of writing such as grammar, organization, vocabulary, and mechanics have the improvement after they were taught by using GIST strategy. This happened probably was caused by the consistent exercises given by the researcher as a teacher. Therefore, grammar had the highest aspect score because in GIST strategy, the students were asked to make a summary by using their own words. It trained the students to make a good sentence by using good grammar. Khoshima and Nia (2014, p. 264) have found out that writing a summary helps the students to understand better how to write well. Meanwhile, developing idea did not have any improvement in this study. In the rubric that the writer used, it was stated that to have a good score in developing idea, a student must have a good coherence. Oshima and Hogue (2006) state that every good paragraph has a topic sentence, the supporting sentences, a concluding sentence, unity, and coherence. The students had difficulty in coherence so that they cannot develop the ideas well. Pilus (1996, p. 4) states that incoherence is a recurring problem in the students writing and can be a major obstacle to their writing. It is proved by Al Badi (2015) found out that most of ESL learners at a university in Australia got difficulty in making text coherent. Moreover, developing ideas aspect did not improve significantly. It influenced the contribution of vocabulary so that vocabulary got the lowest contribution. It can be happened because having high vocabulary is important to develop the ideas in writing. Richardson (2009, p. 4) states that one way to support and develop writing is by having students consider how to incorporate word into their writing. Additionally, it also might be

happened because in the process of leaning, the students only focus on the meaning of the words without considering their function in a sentence. Therefore, the students had difficulty in vocabulary.

Next, the result of independent sample t-test of reading comprehension and writing achievements shows that there were significant difference of the gain value of the students' achievement between the experimental and control groups. However, there are some aspect of reading comprehension did not show the significant difference of the students' achievement between the experimental and control groups in the gain value. Those are sequence, detail, and inference aspects. It could be happened because of some reasons. First, both groups were in the same school level. There is a chance that the students in the experimental group unintentionally shared what they learned during the treatment with their peers in the control group. Second, it is probably because the students seldom read the functional text so that they are not familiar to read a text contains sequence. As Harmer (2007, p. 100) states that the more the students read, the better they get at it. Third, it might be because the writer did not give enough exercises in sequence, detail, and inference aspects.

Finally, the result of multiple regressions showed that vocabulary gave the highest contribution to the students' reading achievement. It could happen because vocabulary knowledge has the essential role to comprehend a text. The students cannot understand a reading text without knowing the meaning of the words. To get the main idea, detail information, inference, sequence, cause and effect, and reference of a text, the students should know the meaning of the words. Nagy (1988, p. 9) states that vocabulary knowledge is fundamental to reading comprehension. The students cannot understand text without knowing what most of the words mean. However, main idea gave the lowest contribution to reading achievement total. It is likely because other aspects gave more influence than main idea aspect. While, some aspects of the writing (organization, grammar, mechanic, and developing idea) are significantly contributed to the students' writing achievement. Organization gave the highest contribution. It could be because during the treatment, the students are introduced to make a summary of a text by using their own words. In this step, the students wrote the summary started from identification to description. The students focused the summary per paragraph so that the students knew how to organize a descriptive text well. In addition, the students have read a descriptive text before they write. Harmer (2007, p.100) states that reading give good model for writing. It means that reading a text before writing could be as an example for the students about the good organization of a text. This helped the students to compose a good descriptive writing.

Conclusions and Suggestions

Based on the findings and interpretations of the study, the writer draws three conclusions. First, at the end of the study it was found that the experimental group has the improvement on reading comprehension and writing achievements. In addition, there was significant difference in reading comprehension and writing achievements between the students who were taught by using GIST strategy and those who were not taught by using GIST strategy. The last, all reading and writing aspects gave contribution to the reading comprehension and writing achievements of the students in the experimental group.

There are some suggestions offered by the writer. The English teacher should provide various kinds of strategies and provide interesting material that can create effective learning in the classroom. In this case, the writer would like to suggest the teachers to use GIST strategy as one of the alternative strategies in teaching reading comprehension and writing. Then the teacher should consider the effective strategy to improve all the aspect of reading comprehension and writing.

References

- Agustina, I., Nasrudin, N., Putra, S., Akrim, A., & Maharani, D. (2020, March). The Effect Of Moodle Implementation In English For Multimedia Classroom On Students' Achievement In Reading And Writing. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Multidisciplinary and Its Applications, WMA-3 2019, 11-14 December 2019, Medan, Indonesia*.
- Al Badi, I. A. H. (2015). Academic writing difficulties of ESL learners. *The 2015 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings*. Retrieved from <http://www.westeasinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/ibtisam-Ali-Hasan-Al-Badi-full-paper.pdf>.
- Alfaki, I. M. (2015). University students' English writing problems: Diagnosis and remedy. *International journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 40-52. Retrieved from www.eajournal.org.
- An, S. (2013). Schema theory in reading. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(1), 130-134. Doi:10.4304/tpls.3.1.130_134.
- Bazerman, C. (2010). A relationship between reading and writing: the conversational model. *College English*, 41(6), 656-661.
- Braxton, D. M. (2009). *The effects of two summarization strategies using expository text on the reading comprehension and summary writing of fourth- and fifth- grade students in an Urban, title 1 school* (Dissertation, University of Maryland, Maryland, USA). Retrieved from <http://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/9918>.
- Broomley, K. (2004). Rethinking vocabulary instruction. *The Language and Literacy Spectrum*, 14, 3-14. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED059520.pdf>.
- Buehl, D. (2023). *Classroom strategies for interactive learning*. Routledge.
- Dromsky, A. M. (2011). *A comparison of two strategies for teaching third graders to summarize information text*. (Dissertation, University of Maryland, Maryland, USA). Retrieved from <http://gradworks.umi.com/34/95/3495558.html>.
- Education First. (2015). *EFI English indeks kecakapan bahasa inggris EF*. Retrieved from <http://www.ef.co.id/epi/sportlights/asia/indonesia>.
- ETS. (2015). *2015 report in test takers worldwide: The toEIC listening and reading test*. Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/s/toEIC/pdf/ww_data_report_unlweb.pdf.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high school*. New York, NY: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & Perenchik, K. C. (2004). *Motivating reading comprehension concept-oriented reading instruction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hakim, M. A. R., Efriyanti, N., Zasrianita, F., & Astari, A. R. N. (2022). English Teachers' Creativity in Preparing and Managing Teaching-Learning Media During Covid-19 Pandemic for Junior High School Students in Indonesia. What Covid-19 Pandemic Has Altered English Teacher's Teaching Practice, 25-38.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Edinburgh Gate, UK: Pearson Education.
- Jozsef, H. (2001). *Advanced writing in English as a foreign language*. Pecs, HU: Lingua Franca Csoport.

- Khoshima, H., & Nia, M. R. (2014). Summarizing strategies and writing ability of Iranian intermediate EFL students. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(4), 263-272.
- Kumar, D., Jaipurkar, R., Shekhar, A., Sikri, G., & Srinivas, V. (2021). Item analysis of multiple choice questions: A quality assurance test for an assessment tool. *Medical Journal Armed Forces India*, 77, S85-S89.
- Lems, K., Miller, L. D., & Soro, T. M. (2009). *Teaching reading to English language learners: Insights from linguistics*. Guilford Press.
- Marbiah. (2012). *Improving students' writing skill by using peer-editing strategy to the eighth grade students of MTs Negeri Lubuklinggau* (Unpublished Magister's thesis) Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.
- McKnight, K. S. (2010). *The teacher's big book of graphic organizers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2012). *Literacy: Empowerment, development and peace*. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/pdf/Indonesia.pdf>.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2014). *Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Retrieved from [http://kemdikbud.go.id/kemdikbud/dokumen/paparan/paparan%20Mendikbud%20pada%20Works hop%20Pers.pdf](http://kemdikbud.go.id/kemdikbud/dokumen/paparan/paparan%20Mendikbud%20pada%20Works%20hop%20Pers.pdf).
- Nagy, W. E. (1988). *Teaching vocabulary to improve reading comprehension*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing academic English* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Pilus, Z. (1996). Coherence and students' errors: Weaving the threads of discourse. *English Teaching Forum*, 34(3), 44-54. Retrieved from <http://dosfanlib.uic.edu/usia/E-USIA/forum/vols/vol34/no3/p44.htm>.
- PISA. (2016). *PISA 2015 results in focus*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-2015-results-in-focus.pdf>.
- Puspayani, A. D. (2012). *The effect of 'GIST' and learning style toward reading comprehension of grade XI students at SMA Dwijendra Bualu in academic year 2011/2012* (Magister's Thesis, Ganesha University, Bali, Indonesia). Retrieved from http://pasca.undiksha.ac.id/e-journal/index.php/jurnal_bahasa/article/download/277/74.
- Richardson, F. (2009). *Writing with wow words and building vocabulary*. Navan, CO: Department of education and skills. Retrieved from https://www.nbss.ie/sites/default/files/publications/mm_wow_words_booklet_cu.pdf.
- Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade*. Chicago, IL: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Smith, R., Snow, P., Serry, T., & Hammond, L. (2021). The role of background knowledge in reading comprehension: A critical review. *Reading Psychology*, 42(3), 214-240
- Stark, M.W. (1981). *A group informal reading inventory: An instrument for the assessment of ESL students' reading performance*. Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/183SDUW>.

- Stevens, E. A., Vaughn, S., House, L., & Stillman-Spisak, S. (2020). The effects of a paraphrasing and text structure intervention on the main idea generation and reading comprehension of students with reading disabilities in grades 4 and 5. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 24*(5), 365-379.
- UNDP. (2013). *Adult literacy rate, both sexes (%ages 15 and older)*. Retrieved from <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/adult-literacy-rate-both-sexes-ages-15-and-older>.
- UNESCO. (2015). *Literacy data centre for regional and country profiles*. Retrieved from <http://www.uis.unesco.org/DataCentre/Pages/country-profile.aspx?regioncode=40515&code=IDN>.
- United Nation. (2015). *Sustainable development goals*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/education/>.
- World Literacy Foundation. (2015). *The economic and social cost of illiterate a snapshot of illiteracy in a global context*. Retrieved from <https://worldliteracyfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/WLF-FINAL-ECONOMIC-REPORT.pdf>.
- Yerger, W. M. (2012). Using the AREA approach to create successful writers. *Scientific Research, 3*, 852-855. Retrieved from <http://www.SciRp.org/journal/ce>.
- Zuhra. (2015). Senior high school students' difficulties in reading comprehension. *English Education Journal (EEJ), 6*(3), 424-441.
- Zubaedi, Hakim, M. A. R., & Asiyah. (2020). The Use of the ASSURE Model in Developing Animation Video as English Teaching Materials for Islamic Kindergarten Students. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 11* (10), 1-19.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).