English Education Journal

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GIST (GENERATING INTERACTIONS BETWEEN SCHEMATA AND TEXT) AND KWL (KNOW, WANT, AND LEARNED) STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE READING ACHIEVEMENT OF MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS

Atiya Mahmud Hana✉, **Warsono, Abdurrachman Faridi**

Postgraduate Program Semarang State University, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
	This study is an experimental research with a factorial design which aimed to find out the effectiveness of GIST and KWL strategies to improve reading achievement of male and female students. The samples of the study were the eleventh students of Senior High School 2 Demak in the academic year of 2014/2015. There were two classes, the first and the second experimental groups. GIST strategy was used in the first experimental group, and KWL strategy was used in the second experimental group. To answer research questions number one up to five, T-test was used. While two-ways ANOVA with F-test at the 5% (0.05) level of significance was used to answer the fifth up to seventh question. The result of this study showed that GIST and KWL strategies are effective to improve reading achievement of male and female students. In additon, there is no significant difference of the use of GIST and KWL strategies to improve reading achievement of male and female students. Futhermore, there is no significant difference of gender in using GIST and KWL strategies to improve reading achievement. Finally, there is no interaction among GIST, and KWL strategies, reading achievement, and gender. © 2015 Semarang State University

✉ Correspondence Address:
Unnes Bendan Ngisor Campus, Semarang, 50233
E-mail: atiyamahmud@yahoo.co.id

INTRODUCTION

Reading skill is very important for students especially Indonesian students. In national examination for English subject, students at senior high school level are tested in two skills, listening and reading. In this study, the reseacher wants to find out the effectiveness of GIST (Generating Interactions between Schemata and Text) and KWL (Know, Want, and Learned) strategies to improve reading achievement of male and female students.

GIST is a teaching strategy used to teach expository and narrative texts (Richardson, 2000). It provides students with a way to summarize information by discarding unimportant information and focusing on the key words or ideas of the passage. In addition, it helps students grab a better overall understanding of the material they just read.

KWL strategy was firstly developed by Dona Ogle in 1986, and is used to guide students through text (Corner, 2006: 1). This strategy has some benefits. First, it encourages students to read actively though the learning events individually or in a group. Second, it improves students' motivation to read since it elicits students' background knowledge of the topic of the text, sets a purpose for reading, allows students to assess their comprehension of the text, helps the students to monitor their comprehension, and provides an opportunity for students to expand ideas beyond the text. Third, it makes the students active and motivated learners, for it allows them to obtain extended reading materials and continue to read more written materials.

Considering the benefits of using GIST and KWL strategies mentioned above, the reseacher wants to find out the effectiveness of both stagies to improve students' reading comprehension with low and high achievement. The result of this study may help English teachers to use innovative strategies in teaching reading classes especially in teaching genres. Reading classes are hoped to be more interesting so that students can be motivated in joining and getting involved in learning process.

Based on the background of the study and reasons for choosing the topic above, the reseacher formulates the statements of the problem as follows: (1) How effective is GIST strategy to improve reading achievement of male students? (2) How effective is GIST strategy to improve reading achievement of female students? (3) How effective is KWL strategy to improve reading achievement of male students? (4) How effective is KWL strategy to improve reading achievement of female students? (5) How significant is the difference of the use of GIST and KWL strategies to improve reading achievement of male and female students. (6) How significant is the difference of male and female students in using GIST and KWL strategies to improve reading achievement? (7) How is the interaction among GIST, KWL, reading achievement, and gender?

METHOD

Experimental design is used in this study. According to Gay (2011: 250), experimental design is the only type of research that can test hypotheses to establish cause-effect relations. Another expert that is Nunan (1992: 24) states that experiment is carried out in order to explore the strength of relationship between variables. There are three variables in this study namely independent variable, dependent variable, and moderator variable. The independent variables are GIST and KWL strategies. The dependent variable is achievement, and the moderator variable is motivation.

In this study, the reseacher uses factorial design since there are two independent variables in this study. According to Gay (2011: 272), factorial design refers to a design that has more than one variable (or grouping variable), also known as a factor. The reseacher uses 2 x 2 (two by two) factorial design that has two factors, and each factor has two levels.

The population of this research is the eleventh graders of senior high school 2 Demak. Two classes are chosen as the samples. They are XI IPA 4 and XI IPA 5. GIST strategy is used to teach XI IPA 4 as the first experimental group,

while KWL strategy is used to teach XI IPA 5 as the second experimental group.

Tests are used in this study as the instruments. Tryout, pre test, and post test are conducted to answer the statements of problem. T-Test is used to answer statements of problem number one up to four. While ANOVA is used to answer statements of problem number five up to seven.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

To answer the first until the fourth research problems, the reseacher used T-test to see the significance difference between pre test and post test. Based on the table 4.19 above, it can be seen that the mean score for male students who learned analytical exposition text by using GIST in pre test was 59.64 and the mean score in post test was 70.35. T count shows -4.707, and df shows 13. It means that $t_{0.05;13} = 1.771$. Since t count = 4.707 > $t_{0.05;13} = 1.771$, so the first null hypothesis of this research is rejected. That means there is significant difference in reading achievement of male students in pre and post test. In other words, GIST strategy is effective to improve reading achievement for male students.

In the second question, the mean score for female students who learned analytical exposition text by using GIST in pre test was 62.91 and the mean score in post test was 74.58. T count shows 7.000, and df shows 23. It means that $t_{0.05;23} = 1.714$. Since t count = 7.000 > $t_{0.05;23} = 1.714$, so the second null hypothesis was rejected. That means there is significant difference in reading achievement of female students in pre and post test. That means that GIST strategy is effective to improve reading achievement for female students.

In the third question, the mean score for male students who learned analytical exposition text by using KWL in pre test was 55.41 and the mean score in post test was 70.00. T count shows 5.239, and df shows 11. It means that $t_{0.05;11} = 1.714$. Since t count = 5.239 > $t_{0.05;11} = 1.714$, so the third null hypothesis was rejected. That means there is significant difference in reading achievement of male students in pre and post test.

In other words, KWL strategy is effective to improve reading achievement for male students.

In the fourth question, the mean score for female students who learned analytical exposition text by using KWL in pre test was 54.58 and the mean score in post test was 70.20. T count shows 7.713, and df shows 23. It means that $t_{0.05;23} = 1.771$. Since t = 7.713 > $t_{0.05;11} = 1.771$, so the fourth null hypothesis was rejected. That means there is significant difference in reading achievement of female students in pre and post test. That means that KWL strategy is effective to improve reading achievement for female students.

In the fifth question, the researcher used ANOVA. From the data shows that Sig of teaching startegies is 0.240 and α = 0.05, so α < Sig. It can be concluded that teaching strategies did not influence students' achievement. In other words, there is no significant difference of the use of GIST and KWL strategies to improve reading achievement, so the fifth null hypothesis was accepted.

In the sixth question, ANOVA was also used to analyze the significance difference of gender in using GIST and KWL to improve reading achievement. Based on the table 4.29, Sig of gender is 0.271 and α = 0.05, so α < Sig. It means that gender did not influence students' reading achievement. In other words, there is no significant difference of gender in using GIST and KWL to improve reading achievement, so the sixth hypothesis was accepted.

In the seventh question, ANOVA was also used to analyze interaction among GIST, KWL, reading achievement, and gender. Based on table 4.29, Sig of Strategies * Model is 0.318 and and α = 0.05, so α < Sig. It means teaching strategies and gender did not play significantly to improve reading comprehension. In other words, there is no interaction among GIST, KWL, reading achievement, and gender, so the seventh null hypothesis was accepted.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this study is GIST and KWL strategies are effective to improve male and

female students. In additon, there is no significant difference of the use of GIST and KWL strategies to improve reading achievement of male and female students. Futhermore, there is no significant difference of gender in using GIST and KWL strategy to improve reading achievement. Finally, there is no interaction among GIST, KWL, reading achievement, and gender.

REFERENCES

Best, J. W. (1981). *Research in Education*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Brown, J. D. (1980). *Principles in Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principle: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Second Edition*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (3rd edition)*. Boston: Thomson Learning, Inc.

Cohen, L., and L. Manion. 1989. *Education Research*. New York: Routledge.

Finochiaro, M. (1974). *English as a Second Language: from Theory to Practice*. New York: Regents Publishing Company, Inc.

Fengjuan, Z. 2010. *The Integration of the Know-Want-Learn (KWL) Strategy into English Language Teaching for Non-English Majors.* Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Bimonthly), Vol. 33 No.4. August 2010.

Gardner, R. C., Trembaly, P. F., & Masgoret, A. (1997). *Towards a Full Model of Second Language Learning: an Empirical Investigation*. The Modern Language Journal 81, 345-62.

Gerot, L., and Wignell, P. (1994). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. New South Wales: Gerd Stabler.

Hadfield, J. (1999). *Presenting New Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hamra, A., and Syatriana, E . (2010). *Developing a Model of Teaching Reading Comprehension for EFL Students.* TEFLIN Journal, Volume 28 21, Number 1, February 2010.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English*. Essex: Pearson Education.

Hussein, M. H. (2014). *KWL-Plus Effectiveness on Improving Reading Comprehension of Tenth Graders of Jordanian Male Students.* Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 4, No. 11, pp. 2278-2288, November 2014.

Kumari, V. S. N., and Jinto, M. (2014). *Effectiveness of KWL Metacognitive Strategy on Achievement in Social Science and Metacognitive Ability in Relation to Cognitive Styles*. International Journal of Educational Research and Technology. Volume 5 [1] March 2014: 92-98

Mc. Kay. (2006). *Researching Second Language Classroom*. London: Lawrence Erlabaum Associates Publisher.

Mikulecky, B. S., and Jeffries, L. (2003). *More Reading Power*. New York: Pearson Education.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Method in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ogle, D. M. (1986). KWL: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *Reading Teacher, 39*, 564-570.

Olsen, R., and S. Kagan. (1992). *About Cooperative Learning. In C. Kessler (ed.), Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book*. New York: Prentice Hall. 1-30.

Philip, A. (2010). *The Effectiveness of KWL (Know, Want To Learn, Learned) in Teaching of Reading Viewed From Students' English Learning Interest (An Experimental Research in the Ninth Grade Students of SMP Negeri 8 Probolinggo Academic Year 2009-2010)*. Retrieved on January 11, 2011. From http://digilib.uns.ac.id/pengguna.php?mn=showview&id=14621

Richards, J. C., and Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approach and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, J., and Morgan, R. (2000). Reading to Learn in the Content Areas. Belmont, CA: Wadssworth.

Riswanto, et al. (2014). *The Effect of Using KWL (Know, Want, Learned) Strategy on EFL Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 4, No. 7(1); May 2014.

Roozkhoon, M., et al. (2013). *Evaluating KWL Charts Strategy in relation to Iranian EFL Learners' Comprehension of Culturally Unfamiliar Texts*. English Linguistics Research Vol. 2, No. 1; 2013.

Ruddell, M. R. (2005). *Teaching Context Reading and Writing.* Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons.

Vacca, R. T. and Vacca, J. A. (1999). *Content Area Reading Literacy and Learning across the Curriculum*. Hoboken: Addison Wesley Educational Publisher.

Woolley, G. (2010). *A Multiple Strategy Framework Supporting Vocabulary Development for Students with Reading Comprehension Deficits.*

Australasian Journal of Special Education, 34, pp. 119-132 doi:10.1375/ajse.34.2.119