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**ABSTRACT**

The objectives of the research were: (1) To prove which strategy (GIST Summarizing or Paraphrasing) was more effective to enhance the reading comprehension of the first grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar (2) To know which strategy (GIST Summarizing or Paraphrasing) was more interesting to enhance the reading comprehension of the first grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar in learning process by using Likert Scale. The population of the research was the first grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar. The researcher used cluster random sampling to take samples. X7 as experimental 1 class and X10 as experimental 2 class. X7 class as GIST Summarizing Strategy class and X10 class as Paraphrasing Strategy class. The researcher collected the data through reading test and questionnaire as research instrument. Based on the findings and discussion of this research, it is concluded that: (1) Using GIST Summarizing strategy is more effective than Paraphrasing to enhance students’ achievement of reading comprehension at the first grade of SMAN 5 Makassar. (2) Students who studied narrative text under GIST Summarizing and Paraphrasing strategy showed great reading interest.
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**INTRODUCTION**

It was widely acknowledged that reading was a vital skill for English language learners in today’s world. It enhanced the development of overall proficiency and provided access to valuable information at work and in school. Reading was often characterized as a receptive skill in which one looks at and attempts to understand what has been written.

According to Grellet (1987), understanding a written text meant extracting the required information from it as accurately and efficiently as possible. It was not only the process of recognition, perception, and interpretation of written materials, but an active one in that it included the cognitive abilities such as guessing / predicting, checking, and asking questions. Carrell (1989) put, “For many students, reading was far the most important of the four skills in second language, particularly in English as a second or foreign language.

Based on the observation, there was a problem in teaching reading of the first grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar. It was evidence from the score of task in answering the questions based on the text. From 32 students who did the task, the mean score of the students from the test was 70. This score includes in fairly classification. So, it was said that the students reading comprehension was not enough. According to the students, they could not answer the question because they did not comprehend the content of the text. Moreover, they did not have many vocabularies to understand the text and they were not interested neither in reading because they though reading were boring. In addition the level of language used in the reading text is included in intermediate level.

To solve this problem, the researcher intended to compare two strategies in learning process to enhance the students’ comprehends. They were GIST Summarizing Strategy and Pharaprasing Strategy. Actually, there were many strategies that had been implemented in teaching reading in the classroom. They were Choral Reading (CR), Paired Reading (PR), PORPE, KWL and SQ3R strategies.

The different this research and the others were the latest researcher only used Paraphrasing strategy and only used GIST Summarizing strategy to improve the reading comprehension. But, this time the researcher wanted to compare those strategies to prove which one of them that effectively enhances the students’ comprehension and identifies the strengths and the weaknesses of them. Based on the consideration, the researcher intended to conduct a research entitled “*The Comparison between GIST Summarizing and Paraphrasing Strategies to Enhance the Reading Comprehension of the First Grade Students of SMAN 5 Makassar”*.

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

**Previous Related Studies**

Khoshnevis (2015) conducted a research to investigate the effect of teaching the summarization of text as a cognitive strategy on achievement of male and female students’ reading comprehension. The results revealed that the instruction of summarization strategy had a significant effect on the participants reading comprehension. The findings of this study suggested that teaching summarization strategy empowers students’ reading comprehension ability**.**

Horton (2014) reported in his research to the effects of the modified GIST strategy on the reading comprehension of English language learners with disabilities. The findings of this research indicated that the five participants were able to improve their ability to write summary statements after participating in the modified GIST strategy instruction at a meaningful level. Additionally, the participants were able to maintain their ability to summarize text two weeks after the modified GIST strategy was removed. The results of the generalization probes were variable and some of the participants demonstrated the ability to summarize expository science passages

Suwanto (2014) reported in his research to know effectiveness or not of the paraphrasing strategy measured by seeing reading interest in the literal and inferential reading comprehension abilities, and the contributions of the reading interest to literal and inferential comprehension between the students learning through the paraphrasing strategy and those learning without the paraphrasing strategy. The findings of this research indicated that here is an effectiveness paraphrasing strategy measured by looking at reading interest in the literal and inferential reading comprehension abilities.

Hans (2015) reported in his research to know the effectiveness of paraphrasing strategy in increasing university students’ reading comprehension  
and writing achievement. The findings of this research indicated that the improvement of students’ reading comprehension achievement, students’ writing achievement is also increased by the use of paraphrasing strategy since the students can rewrite the text in to their own writing style. Therefore, the use of paraphrasing strategy is considered as one of the beneficial ways used to enhance students’ reading comprehension and writing achievement.

**The Concept of Reading Comprehension**

Research studies on reading comprehension had revealed that reading was a complex cognitive activity that was crucial for adequate functioning and for obtaining information in current society and requires an integration of memory and meaning construction (Alfassi, 2004). Students needed to know how to learn from reading in order to be able to enter the present literate society and have a successful communication. Reading had been defined as an active process in which readers shifted between sources of information, elaborate meaning and strategies, monitor their comprehension, and use the social context to reflect their response (Walker, 2000).

Souvignier, *et.al* (2006) defined reading comprehension as the reader’s ability “to read and remember, reproduce, learn from, and find deeper meaning in text for later use. “Moreover, in the process of reading the reader not only needed to comprehend the direct meaning of what he/she is reading, but, he/she also needed to understand the implied meaning of the text. According to Tierney *et.al* (2005), “Learning to read was not only learning to recognize words; it was [also] learning to make sense of texts”. (Karbalaei, 2010, p.166). Pressley (2002) stated that reading involves a lot of cognitive capacity which was available for understanding the reading materials.

The main goal of reading was reading comprehension, especially functional literacy tasks. Reading comprehension, which was a task that comprises many skills, described outcome of taking out the meaning from a written text by using one’s intellect. Curtis (2002) believed that there were a number of skills that the reader needed to employ in order to achieve maximum reading comprehension, skills such as: deciding about the main idea of the reading text, making questions regarding the content of the text and being able to answer those questions by employing context clues, and summarizing the passage.

Finally, reading comprehension could be defined as the term used to identify some skills, needed to understand and apply information contained within the researcher form. It refered to the act of getting thought from printed symbols in which that there was a significant relevance between the previous experience and the reading comprehension ability.

**The Concept of Generating Interaction between Schemata and Text (GIST) Summarizing**

According to Cunningham (1982) GIST was a summarizing strategy to use to assist students’ comprehension and summary writing skills. Students used higher order thinking skills to analyse and synthesize what they had read. Hambree (2008) said that GIST is an acronym for Generating Interaction between Schemata and Text. The activity of doing GIST was trying to figure out the plan or purpose for what the author has written. Related to schemata, Khemlani & Lynne in Fauziah (2012:18) had proposed that, efficient readers used prior knowledge of content and textual features stored in schemata to enlarge the meaning of the text.

The GIST strategy thought students to write a 20-word summary of a reading selection by answering the "five W and H" journalism questions -- who, what, when, where, why and how. For example, "Who was the main character of this story?" "When did the story take place?" "What happened in the story?" "Why did you think the characters did what they did?" "How did the character's actions impact the story?" The 20-word summary was known as the "GIST" of the reading selection .This technique often was taught using expository or informational texts such as newspaper articles and textbooks. The GIST strategy could be applied to narratives as well, and was especially helpful when students were expected to summarize at the end of each chapter of a novel, or a section of a short story (Wormeli, 2005).

According to Schuder (1989) the steps for implementing this strategy with Middle/High School students were: (1) Introduce a text to the students through a read-aloud, partner reading, or independent reading (2) Break the text up into different sections (this will vary depending on both length of the text and ability of your students) (3) For each section of the text, instruct the students to determine the WHO, WHAT, WHEN, WHERE, and WHY (4) Once the entire text and all GIST statements have been completed, have students use all of their Gist statements from each section in order to write a summary of the completed text.

Finally, this strategy could be implemented and completed as a whole class. To read the text, the students could participate in popcorn reading or the teacher could perform a read-aloud. Following, the students could work together to form a GIST statement through discussion.

**The Concept of Paraphrasing Strategy**

Paraphrase” is a verb which means to re-write a phrase or sentence with the same meaning but using different words. Paraphrasing is a very important skill for most English tests, including TOEFL iBT, IELTS and TOEIC Speaking and Writing. In TOEFL iBT, for instance, paraphrasing is an important skill in the reading section, in the listening section and, above all, in the speaking and writing sections of the test.

To paraphrase is to rewrite something using different words without changing the original meaning. This is what is usually meant by the phrase „in your own words‟. The paraphrase should be clearer and more easily understood than the original and is often about the same length. Paraphrases are a good alternative to using direct quotations.

Paraphrasing strategy is using your own words to express someone else's ideas whilst still preserving the main ideas of the original source. Even when you paraphrase you must still give credit to the original author. One way to avoid plagiarising is to paraphrase an entire paragraph, rather than attempting sentence by sentence.

**The Concept of Interest**

Interest is being one of the important factors in order to increase the students’ comprehension achievement in reading. If one has interest to read, it means that he or she will get a good achievement. On the other side, if the reader has no any interest to read, it can influence his or her achievement.

Interest usually refers to an activity that a person prefers to engage in, would not avoid and would choose in preferences to many others activities. Interest also refers to the kinds of thing we appreciate and enjoy. Thus, the selection of any occupation and satisfaction we get from our work usually depend more on our interest than our ability. They further state that interest and ability are closely related but our interest gives us motivation to use our ability. If we are strong in doing something, we will work hard at it than if we are not interested in.

By looking at the definitions of the interest above, the researcher can conclude that interest is a feeling of wanting to know or learn about something where someone has a positive attitude towards something he or she really likes and enjoys.

The categorize interest into four types, namely: expressed interest, manifested interest, tested interest, and inventoried interest. The relationship between interest and learning is further fleshed out by the observation that new learning is depending upon interest. Learning cannot occur unless the organism is interested in learning.

The study of interest is complex and diverse because when we really think about it, we found that our interesting, or the determinants of our actions are complex and diverse the problem with the term interest is that it encompasses so much. Especially when we speak of interest we refer to factors we initiate and direct behaviour and to those that determine the intensity and the persistence. Thus interest gets up and going to energize us (Singer, 1985).

**RESEARCH METHOD**

**Design and Variables**

The researcher applied an experimental research. The experimental designs involved selecting two groups differing on some independent variable and comparing them on some dependent variable. Independent variable: GIST Summarizing Strategy and Paraphrasing Strategy. Dependent variable: students’ achievement in reading comprehension and interest of the students.

**Population and Sample**

The population of the research was the first grade students of SMAN 5 Makassar. It consisted of 12 classes and each class consists of 36 students, so the total of population was 432 students. The researcher used cluster random sampling to take samples. X7 as experimental 1 class and X10 as experimental 2 class. X7 class as GIST Summarizing Strategy class and X10 class as Paraphrasing Strategy class. Each class had 36 students, so the amounts of sample were 72 students.

**Instrument**

In this research, the researcher collected the data through reading test and questionnaire as research instrument. The improvement of the students in reading comprehension by using GIST Summarizing and Paraphrasing Strategy was measured by giving reading test to the students that administer in pretest and posttest. The test consisted of multiple choice as much as 30 items. The questionnaire was given to find out the students’ interest in learning English by using GIST Summarizing and Paraphrasing Strategy. The questionnaire consisted of 20 items.

**Treatment**

Treatment was conducted for 6 meetings. GIST Summarizing Strategy was used in teaching for experimental 1 class. Paraphrasing Strategy was used in teaching experimental 2 class.

1. Experimental 1 class.
2. At the first meeting, the researcher explained about GIST Summarizing Strategy and explained about the text that was learned. In this case, the types of texts that was learned based on the curriculum, was narrative text.
3. In the second meeting, the researcher implemented GIST Summarizing Strategy in teaching process to comprehend a narative text. The activities in this meeting were:
   * + 1. The researcher provided one text and this text is given to the students.
       2. The students read the text carefully to find out the main idea of the text.
       3. The students made some question related to the text which they have read. They start their question with 5W +1H.
       4. The students wrote the gist of what they have read in 40 words or less.
4. In the third meeting until sixth meeting the students did the same activity as in the second meeting but the different were the text is used in the learning process.
5. Experimental 2 class
6. At the first meeting, the researcher explained about Paraphrasing Strategy and explained about the text that was learned. In this case, the types of texts that were learned based on the curriculum were narrative text.
7. In the second meeting, the researcher implemented Paraphrasing Strategy in learning and comprehends a recount text. The activities in this meeting were:
8. The researcher provided one text and this text is given to the students.
9. The students read the text carefully and underline, or note, any important specific words.
10. The students look up any difficult words, and try to find synonyms for them.
11. The students tried to find different ways of expressing the information in the groups of words (phrases).
12. The students rewrote each sentence with new vocabulary without changing the meaning.
13. The students revised what they had written, comparing it to the original.
14. In the fourth meeting until sixth meeting the students did the same activity such as in the second meeting but the different was the text that was used in the learning process.

**Procedure of Collecting Data**

The procedure of collecting data consisted of two steps: pre-test and post-test.

1. Pre-test

In this step, the students were given pre-test. The tests consisted of 30 multiple choice items. It had been validated and reliable by expert validator. The purpose of the test was to know the prior ability of the students to comprehend the text before the treatment had been given.

* + 1. Post-test

In this step, the students were given the test with the same questions as in the pre-test. The purpose of this test was to know the enhancement of the student’s comprehension after the treatment was given. Moreover, the students were given the questionnaire to know the student’s interest after the treatment is given.

**Data Analysis**

Finding the significant different between pretest and posttest in a group by using Paired Sample T-test analysis in Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) analysis version 20. Finding the significant different between experimental groups 1 and experimental group 2 by Independent Sample T-test analysis in Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) analysis version 20.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Research Findings**

* 1. The frequency and percentage of pretest and posttest score for GIST Summarizing class (E1) and Paraphrasing class (E2)

The students’ research achievement both pretest and posttest for the research subjects are tabulated in the table below:

Table 4.1 Frequency and Percentage of Pretest Score for Both Groups

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | GIST Summarizing/E1 | | Paraphrasing/ E2 | |
| Pretest | | Pretest | |
| F | P (%) | F | P (%) |
| Excellent | 96-100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Good | 86-95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good | 78-85 | 11 | 31 | 5 | 14 |
| Fairly Good | 66-75 | 17 | 47 | 18 | 50 |
| Fair | 56-65 | 7 | 19 | 11 | 31 |
| Poor | 36-55 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Very Poor | 0-36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 36 | 100 | 36 | 100 |

Based on Table 4.1 above, it was known that most of the students’ pretest result for good, fairly good, fair and poor category. In E1 class, the data of pretest showed that there are 11 students (31%) got good score, 17 students (47%) got fairly good score, 7 students (19%) got fair score and 1 students (3%) got poor score. In, E1 class most of students got fairly good score in pretest. While in E2 class, there are 5 students (14%) got good score, 18 students (50%) got fairly good score, 11 students (31 %) got fair score and 2 students (6%) got poor score. In E2 class most of students got fairly good score in pretest. So, it can be concluded the the mean score of students for both groups is almost same.

Table 4.2 Frequency and Percentage of Posttest Score for Both Groups

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | GIST Summarizing/E1 | | Paraphrasing/ E2 | |
| Posttest | | Post test | |
| F | P (%) | F | P (%) |
| Excellent | 96-100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Good | 86-95 | 22 | 61 | 9 | 25 |
| Good | 78-85 | 14 | 39 | 22 | 61 |
| Fairly Good | 66-75 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| Fair | 56-65 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Poor | 36-55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 0-36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 36 | 100 | 36 | 100 |

Based on Table 4.2 above, it was known that most of the students’ posttest result for very good, good, fairly good, and fair category. In E1 class, the data of posttest showed that there are 22 students (61%) got very good score and 14 students (39%) got good score. In E1 class most of students got very good score in posttest. While in E2 class, there are 9 student (25%) got very good score, 22 students (61%)got good score, 4 students (11 %) got fairly good score and 1 students (3%) got fair score. In E2 class most of students got good score in posttest.

From the description of the reading in pretest and posttest result as shown in Table 4.1 and 4.2, it gave clear classification as well on the students’ achievement on their reading after conducting the treatment by applying GIST Summarizing for E1 and Paraphrasing for E2. The data tabulation for the students’ achievement in the reading can be seen as follows:

Table 4.3 Students’ Achievement Result in Pretest and Posttest

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pretest | | Posttest | |
| E1 | E2 | E1 | E2 |
| N | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| Mean | 70.25 | 68.06 | 85.78 | 80.17 |
| Std. Deviation | 8.388 | 7.826 | 4.389 | 6.640 |

The table 4.3 above shows the different students’ score for both two group in pretest and posttest. For E1 class, the mean score of the student improved from 70.25 with standard deviation 8.388 to 85.78 with standard deviation 4.389. For E2 class, the mean score of the students also improved significantly from 68.06 with standard deviation 7.826 to 80.17 with standard deviation 6.640. From the data showed in table 4.1 and 4.2, the pretest mean score of E1 and E2 was slight different for the score before giving the treatment. After giving the treatment, the posttest score to both of the groups; GIST Summarizing and Paraphrasing class showed a difference score of mean score. It means that there was an improvement in reading between two groups after giving the treatment.

**Discussion**

Based on the findings above, the comparison of the students’ improvement in experimental 1 class and experimental 2 class can be proven by analysing the post-test result. The result shows that the mean score of the students’ post-test in both of the groups is increased after giving the treatment. It can be seen through the mean score of the students’ pre-test which was 70.25 (fairly good classification) becomes 85.78 (very good classification) in the post-test for the experimental 1 class, while the students’ pre-test for experimental 2 class was 68.06 (fairly good classification) becomes 80.17 (fairly good classification) in the post-test. In this case, both of the groups improved after giving treatment, but the experimental 1 class was higher than the experimental 2 class (85.78 > 80.17).

There were several factors influencing the result of GIST Summarizing is higher than Paraphrasing. Firstly, in this strategy provided the steps that easier in using and understood by the teacher. It is same like Brown (2000) said that GIST Summarizing presents a detailed step-by step outline of what a reader should accomplish while reading. In addition, Artis (2008) also believe that GIST Summarizing introduces a diverse set of mega cognitive reading techniques in a way students can easily understand and implement. Second, the students’ interest in reading comprehension is improved. This strategy gives the positive interest to the students. It can be known from the questionnaire which is distributed to the students related to the GIST Summarizing. The result of the students interest is higher than the student’s interest which taught by Paraphrasing. It also supported the findings of Artis (2008) research which said that GIST Summarizing causes students to change their negative thoughts on reading textbooks. Third, the use of survey step. In this step the student survey or predict the content of the text before read all the text. It allows the students to be more creative construct the information in their mind, their prior knowledge to comprehend the text. This findings also supported by the previous findings which stated that GIST Summarizing helps the students to construct the information in their mind, and make it meaningful (Sihaloho, *et.al,* 2010).

The data of the experimental 1 class score of interest through the questionnaire (table 4.7) indicated those 14 (38.9%) students whose scores were in the very interested classification, 19 (52.8%) students whose scores were in interested classification, and 3 (8.3%) students whose scores were in moderate classification. Whereas, in experimental 2 class indicated that 4 (11,1%) students whose scores were in the very interested classification, 10 (27.7%) students whose score in interested classification, 18 (50%) students whose scores were in moderate classification and 3 (8.3%) students whose scores were in low interested classification.

From these findings, it can be inferred that most of the students have more positive responds to the use of GIST Summarizing than Paraphrasing as strategy in improving students reading comprehension. Furthermore, the mean score of GIST Summarizing that very interested classification was 80.61 whereas the mean score of Paraphrasing that moderate classification was 67.75. Therefore, GIST Summarizing is more effective in improving the students’ reading comprehension achievement and students’ interest in learning English, especially in reading class.

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

**Conclusions**

Based on the findings and discussion of this research, it is concluded that: (1) Using GIST Summarizing strategy is more effective than Paraphrasing to enhance students’ achievement of reading comprehension at the first grade of SMAN 5 Makassar. This is indicated by the higher scores the students obtained after being taught under GIST Summarizing strategy as opposed to those who studied under Paraphrasing strategy. (2) Students who studied narrative text under GIST Summarizing and Paraphrasing strategy showed great reading interest. However, the interest degree between the two experimental classes was different. Students learnt through GIST Summarizing strategy were more interested to read it. Thus, using GIST Summarizing strategy in teaching reading comprehension is more interesting than Paraphrasing to enhance students’ reading comprehension achievement of the first grade of SMAN 5 Makassar.

**Suggestions**

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher would like to propose some suggestions as follows: (1) Since GIST Summarizing strategy enables the learners to comprehend reading text in interesting way, researcher suggests this strategy to be used by the English teacher of SMAN 5 Makassar. (2) Further research might explore more about the usefulness of GIST Summarizing strategy to enhance students’ engagement, motivation, and achievement in learning English. Researcher also recommends for future research to investigate the appropriateness of the strategy for learner style of learning English.
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