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Abstract
Writing can represent students’ ability because it is covered some aspects. They are the usage of appropriate words, the usage of correct grammatical, and the usage of good marks. The problems which are faced by the students are they do not know what they are going to write and they can write but their writing is not in good organization although the teacher had explained about the generic structure of the text. Here, the researcher focuses on the GIST strategy which is used by teacher in teaching writing descriptive text. In this study, the researcher wants to know whether there is a correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text at Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik. Besides, the researcher also want to know whether there is correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text according to the gender at Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik. This study uses correlation design. The researcher conducted this study in VIII A class of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik. There were 28 students which consist of 16 male students and 12 female students. The instruments of this study were questionnaire and students’ writing test. Questionnaire were distributed to get perception of GIST strategy data and students’ writing descriptive test was given to get students’ writing skill data. The researcher analyzed the data by using Pearson Coefficient Correlation. Based on the results, it can be concluded that the students who have better perception of GIST strategy to be possible to have good writing descriptive text and the female students have better perception of GIST strategy than the male students. As the prove that female students have better writing in class descriptive text score than male students.
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1. Introduction
Ningsih (2011) told in her research that writing is structured activity because it is demanded some abilities to be learnt by the students. Those are about appropriate words, correct grammatical and good marks in every words and sentences. Ozdemir and Aydin (2015) stated that writing is breakthrough process, it does not only talk about focus on the product in the end of the class but also talk the other aspects such us conceiving the idea, making the outline for the whole writing, and doing correction in the writing.

Huy (2015) told about the good outcomes which are had by the learners if they are good in writing. It will give good effects in some areas. The first is, writing can enhance learners’ confidence in arranging and choosing the words, and using correct grammar. The second, writing belongs to the good way to support other skills in English. The third is for understanding written information in printing or electronic media, and the last is preparing the learners to get a job which needs English skill as its requirements.

According to Luh (2010), teaching strategy is practicable strategy to ameliorate reading comprehension of the learners and gather prior knowledge of the learners. The strategy which draws the key information in the certain text and helps the students’ comprehension is GIST strategy (Putri, Suparman, and Hasan, 2014). The students have their own perception about the way the material which is delivered or the strategy which is enforced at classroom. The students decide to think and give opinion about the strategy which is enforced whether the strategy works or not. Perception is important in this situation because perception can represent about the learners’ feeling about the strategy.

As the Junior High School students’, they are demanded to write kind texts as like descriptive text. In fact, writing descriptive process is not an easy activity for some learners. Mostly teacher and students find many troubles...
which are faced by the students when writing. They are the learners get confused about the text that they are going to write.

In the type of gender of the students, there are found some researchers who did research to identify about gender issue between females and males students. Kamari, Gorjian, and Pazakh (2012) stated that in writing expressive text and opinion one-paragraph essay proficiency for female and male students show different result. The teacher necessitates to aware and implement kinds of attractive and innovative the way to teach male students in this skill. Male students also need more motivation in studying (Bijami, Kashef, Khaksari, 2013).

Outlining is an activity for making framework and it is done after deciding the topic and before rewriting or writing the entire text or story. Outline is as the ladder before writing the text totally and the basic concept of the text because in outlining the students will gather the prior knowledge about the topic. The students can employ the prior knowledge, experience in reading and watching the similar topic as material for writing.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher wants to conduct study which chooses to carry on the study at Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik because of some reasons. The reasons why the researcher chooses Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik are this school has A accreditation, often joins in English competition, and has program which expects the learners to speak English minimal one hour a week.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher devises the problems, as follow:

1. Is there any correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text at Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik?
2. Is there any correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text according to gender at Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik?

2. Methods

The researcher determines to apply quantitative correlation as the design of this study. Correlation design is design which identifies the correlation among two variables. Those are independent variable and dependent variable. This study correlates between perception of GIST strategy and students” writing descriptive text at Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik. Besides, this study also correlates between perception of GIST strategy and students” writing descriptive text according to the gender at Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik.

Population and Sample

Population is the entire research subject in the direct place for doing the research and for collecting the data. The population of this study is all of the students who are in the eighth grade of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik. The total students of the eighth grade of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik are 142 students.

Sample

This study uses cluster sampling technique. Cluster sampling is the mode to collect the sample randomly. Cluster sampling is also used for a group of individuals who are together naturally. Ary (1990:175) stated that if the unit is taken, it is not kind of individual but a group of individual who are placed naturally that is cluster sampling. This researcher chooses one of five classes of eight grade of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik. The class which is chosen is VIII A class and use VIII B as the class which is carried on the try out because the researcher investigates the correlation according to the gender too.

Data Collection

Instrument

Questionnaire

The questionnaire in this research is for knowing the perception of strategy which is enforced by the educator in writing descriptive text class. The researcher creates the instrument for the research. So, in conducting final questionnaire, the researcher needs to do try out for testing the questionnaire before it is given to the subjects of the research. The researcher decides to do try out in the VIII B class. The questionnaire which is created belongs to closed questionnaire. There are five scales are in the questionnaire. They are in the range number 1 to 5. There are five dimensions in the questionnaire which is investigated by the researcher.

The dimensions are taken from Bernaus and Gardner (2008) but the content is developed by the researcher. They mention the aspects of perception which researcher has explained in the former chapter. The researcher determines to take from six aspects. The aspects which are not taken by the researcher are the orientation of the instrumental and the support of parents. The researcher changes those aspects with interpersonal communication because the importance of well communication in learning process as Wei and Elias (2011) stated.

Test

The researcher conducts test to evaluate the students” writing descriptive text. The students are afforded a text about descriptive text. To check the validity of the test the researcher uses content validity. Content validity is done to
know the test is assumed or not. The researcher gets the standard competence and indicators by adopting the syllabus of English for the eighth grade.

The researcher asks the writing rubric to the English educator at Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik. The aspects of writing are capacity, organization, lexicon, language use, and mechanic. There will be three raters to measure the writing test of the students because writing test is kind of subjective test.

The Procedure of Collecting Data

First the students will understand the text, write the 20 key points of the story, write the draft of the story, and then compose the last copy of the story after getting some corrections on the draft. Then, the last copy is assessed by three raters.

The second is distributing questionnaire to the students of VIII A related to the GIST strategy which is utilized by the educator while the teacher is teaching writing descriptive text.

Data Analysis

The data of perception of GIST strategy is gotten from the questionnaire and the writing descriptive text data of the students is gotten from the test. The questionnaire and test show two kinds of data. The first is ordinal data which arrives from the data of questionnaire in order to know the perception of GIST strategy. Meanwhile the second is continuous data which arrives from the writing descriptive text. The independent variable (X) is ordinal and the dependent variable (Y) is continuous.

First, the researcher counts the total of the mark in the questionnaire each student and checks the validity of the questionnaire from VIII B by using SPSS 15.0. to know whether the items in the questionnaire are accepted or deleted. If there is item which must be deleted, the researcher must revise the details and do the try out again until all the items are accepted. But, if the researcher checks the validity and all the items are accepted, then the questionnaire can be distributed to VIII A class.

Second, the researcher will use Pearson Correlation Coefficient to answer the first problem statement. Pearson Correlation Coefficient counts the data in the form of ordinal which is nonparametric and continuous which is parametric. In this study there are two data. Those are GIST strategy questionnaire and writing test.

To answer the second problem statement the researcher uses Pearson Correlation Coefficient too. But the difference is the data from the students” writing score and the questionnaire will be separated into two parts according to the students” gender. The male students are analyzed firstly and the female students are secondly after male students. Both data from male and female students are correlated with the same ways.

3. Findings

There were five aspects with twenty items in the questionnaire. The aspects were about learning motivation, learning strategy, learning activity, interpersonal communication, and learning evaluation. There were three criteria to know what the student belonged to. They were high (76-100), average (51-75), and low (0-50).

Before testing the questionnaire to the sample of this study the researcher tried out the questionnaire to the other class to know the validity of the test. All items in the questionnaire were accepted. The researcher did not need to change the content in the questionnaire and it could be used for VIII A Class as the sample of the study.

Then, the researcher disseminated the questionnaire to the VIII A Class. The result of the students who got high, average, and low score on the questionnaire could be checked below.

| Students | Sum of the students | Sum of the students who get high score | Sum of the students who get average score | Sum of the students who get low score | The average score of questionnaire |
|----------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Female   | 12                  | 9                                     | 2                                        | -                                   | 82.25                            |
| Male     | 16                  | 7                                     | 9                                        | 1                                   | 69.37                            |
| Total    | 28                  | 16                                    | 11                                       | 1                                   | 75.81                            |

From the table above, it could be explained that the result of the questionnaire from two genders showed that there were 9 female students (75%) who got high score, 2 female students (16.6%) who got average score. Besides, there were 7 male students (43.75%) who got high score, 9 male students (56.25%) who got average score, and 1 male student (6.25%) who got low score. Students who got high score inclined to have good writing in their writing test, while students who got average score sometimes had average skill in writing too. They could write, but they were not really fluent in it. Students whose score were low sometimes they found difficulties when they were writing. Therefore, the
students who had low score were suggested to more understand about the topic which was being explained. They also should follow the steps in the strategy to get good result in their writing.

The Result of Students’ Writing Descriptive Text

There were four criteria based on the rubric of writing. The criteria were excellent was for the students who got score in the range of 90-100, good was for score in the range of 79-89, weak was for the students which score in the range of 68-78, and poor was for the students who get score less than 68.

This table below presented the students’ writing test by showing the number of the average score and the gender.

| No. | Gender | Average score of students |
|-----|--------|---------------------------|
|     |        | Excellent | Good | Weak | Poor |
| 1.  | Male   | 83.53     | 73.46| 55.66|      |
| 2.  | Female | 84.90     | 75.53|      |      |

From the table above showed that male students’ good average score was 83.53, male students’ weak average score was 73.46, male students’ poor average score was 55.66, and there were not male students who got excellent average score. On the other hand, female students’ good average score was 84.90, female students’ weak average score was 75.53, and there were not female students who got excellent and poor average score in writing descriptive text.

| No. | Gender | Highest score | Lowest score |
|-----|--------|---------------|--------------|
| 1.  | Male   | 85.28         | 55.66        |
| 2.  | Female | 88.01         | 70.11        |

From table above, the researcher knew that the highest score for male student was 85.28 and the lowest score for male student was 55.66. Meanwhile the highest score for female student was 88.01 and the lowest score for female student was 70.11. The average score of the class was 78.21.

The result above could be concluded that male students had lower ability in writing than female students because the highest score was in female students and the lowest score was in male students or we could state that female had better skill in writing descriptive text.

Pearson Correlation Coefficient

To determine the correlation between GIST strategy and students’ writing skill, the researcher used Pearson Correlation Coefficient. Such Butler (1985) stated to measure the correlation among the ordinal data from GIST questionnaire score which belonged to nonparametric and ratio data from students’ writing score which belonged to parametric the researcher should use Pearson Correlation Coefficient.

Here, the result of the calculation of correlation between GIST strategy and students’ writing skill.

| Writing | GIST |
|---------|------|
| Pearson | .800(**) |
| Correlation | |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| N | 28 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the table, we could see that the correlation score was 0.800. Based on the classification in the former chapter stated that 0.800 belonged to be very strong correlation. It meant that there was positive and very strong correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text.

From the result of the correlation, it could be concluded that perception of GIST strategy and students writing skill in the Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik were positive and strongly correlated.
Meanwhile the researcher applied Pearson Correlation Coefficient to find the correlation from both genders. Here the researcher should divide the result of GIST strategy questionnaire data and students’ writing descriptive score data into two according to the gender. Here, the result of the calculation of correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing skill according to the male gender.

### Table 4.1.3.2 The correlation between GIST strategy and students’ writing skill according to the gender (Male students)

|          | Writing          | GIST       |
|----------|------------------|------------|
| Pearson  | 1                | .771(**)   |
| Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000       |
| N        | 16               | 16         |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table above presented that the Pearson Correlation was 0.771. Based on the classification the previous chapter, if the Pearson Correlation was between 0.60-0.799 belonged strong correlations. It meant that there was strong correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text according to the male students.

The second step was the researcher correlated perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text according to the female students.

#### Table 4.1.3.3 The correlation between GIST strategy and students’ writing skill according to the gender (Female students)

|          | Writing          | GIST       |
|----------|------------------|------------|
| Pearson  | 1                | .821(**)   |
| Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) | .001       |
| N        | 12               | 12         |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From the table we could see that the correlation was 0.821. According to the classification stated that 0.821 belonged to very strong. It meant that there was strong correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text. Two table tables above showed that female students had higher correlation than male students.

### Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was to determine whether the null hypothesis (Ho) could be rejected or not. The explanation in the previous chapter which the researcher mentioned before stated that there were two hypotheses in this study.

From table 4.1.3.1, it showed that p-value of GIST strategy and students’ writing skill was 0.000. It is lower than 0.05 so the first null hypothesis (Ho) could be rejected at 0.05 level and working hypothesis (Ha) could not be rejected. It could be conclude that, there was significant correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text in 8th grade students of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik.

From table 4.1.3.2 and table 4.1.3.3, those tables showed that p-value of perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text according to male students 0.001 and female students were 0.000. It is lower than 0.05 so the second null hypothesis (Ho) could be rejected at 0.05 level and working hypothesis (Ha) could not be rejected. It could be concluded that, there was significant correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text according to the gender in 8th grade students of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik.

The Correlation between Perception of GIST strategy and Students’ Writing Descriptive Text and The Correlation between Perception of GIST strategy and Students’ Writing Descriptive Text According to The Gender
As the result of the coefficient correlation value which was 0.800, it showed that the correlation between GIST strategy and students’ writing skill in 8th grade of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik was positive and strong. It was also supported by the result of hypothesis testing whose significant value was 0.000 so null hypotheses (Ho) could be rejected at 0.05 levels. Thus, there was enough evidence to conclude that perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text were significantly, positively, and strongly correlated.

And it also happened in the second coefficient correlation value which was 0.771 and the third coefficient correlation value which was 0.821. It showed that the correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text according to the gender in 8th grade of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik were significantly, positively, and strongly correlated. It was also supported by the result of hypothesis testing whose significant values were 0,000 and 0.001 so null hypothesis (Ho) could be rejected at 0.05 levels.

4. Discussion

The researcher took GIST data from GIST strategy questionnaire which was distributed to the VIII A Class and took students’ writing descriptive text data from students’ writing test in writing descriptive text. Then the researcher correlated both scores by using Pearson Coefficient Correlation through SPSS 15.0.

The answer in the questionnaire showed that for item number 1 there were eleven students (39.28%) agreed that they liked if in writing skill they were asked to write. Then, the researcher saw the negative question in item number 2. There were ten students (35.71%) who did not agree that they were bored when writing lesson because of only writing the text. These answers proved that there were not big problem when the students were asked to write. They could understand that in English class they should be able to write. Item number 3, there were ten students (35.71%) answered did not know whether GIST strategy could improve their ability in writing lesson or not.

Then, there were seventeen students (60.71%) answered that they did not really agree for item number 4 that GIST strategy did not really help them in writing process. From item number 3 and number 4 the researcher could see that the students believed that actually GIST strategy helped them in writing lesson although they did not feel it at that time.

There were eleven students (39.28%) who answered strongly agree for item number 5 which stated that the students liked if GIST strategy was done inside the classroom and there were eleven students (39.28%) who answered not really agree for item number 6 which stated that the students liked if GIST strategy was done outside the classroom. From these answers the researcher knew that the students preferred to write inside the classroom rather than outside the classroom. It could be done because of the students needed concentration and supported place to write.

For item number 7, there were fifteen students (53.57%) chose agree that the students felt if GIST strategy is pleaser than writing the whole text directly. Then, fourteen students (50%) chose that they did not really agree for item number 8. The question stated that the students felt that GIST strategy was not really pleased. The percentages from item number 7 and 8 showed that the students enjoyed if the teacher applied GIST strategy in writing.

There were twelve students (42.85%) agreed for item number 9 which stated that the students could understand clearly descriptive text which was given and also twelve students (42.85%) chose did not really agree for item number 10 which the students just understood a few sentences in descriptive text. These results gave information that the student could understand well about descriptive text which was being explained. The next is item number 11. There were fifteen students (53.57%) gave their choice on strongly agree. They strongly agreed that they could write 20 keywords on the descriptive text which was about Borobudur Temple. And there were sixteen students (57.14%) gave their choice on did not agree for item number 12. The statement was the students only could write less than 20 keywords on the descriptive text. Their choice showed that they were able to write 20 keywords on the descriptive text about Borobudur Temple well.

There were ten students (35.71%) decided to choose agree for item number 13. The statement was the students could understand the instructions which were delivered by the teacher in the learning process. And there were ten students (35.71%) decided to choose did not really agree for item number 14. This item stated that the students could understand a few instructions and they would ask if they did not understand about the instructions. These answers had same percentages. The instructions which were given could be understood by some students, and the rest could not understand the instruction well. The students” answer could be meant that some instructions were delivered in good way, but some instructions were delivered differently. It could be the sentences were too long, so the students” were confused about what they had to do.

Item number 15 showed that there were eleven students (39.28%) chose agree for statement that the students could put their job in the classroom when writing lesson by using GIST strategy. Item number 16 showed that there were twelve students (42.85%) chose did not really agree for statement that the students were difficult to put their job in the class when writing lesson by using GIST strategy. It meant the students understood with their job at the classroom during teaching and learning process.

Twelve students (42.85%) chose agree for item number 17. The students agreed that they could communicate well when writing lesson by using GIST strategy. Ten students (35.71%) chose not really agree for item number 18 which stated that the students were difficult to communicate when writing lesson by using GIST strategy. The students” choices informed that the students did not find any difficulties in communicating when the teacher used GIST strategy for writing skill.
There were thirteen students (46.42%) who chose agree for item number 19. The students agreed that they could write good descriptive text with 20 keywords which they had written before as the helper. And twelve students (42.85%) decided to choose not really agree for item number 20. The statement was the students felt difficult to write good descriptive text although with 20 keywords which they had written before as the helper. From these answers the researcher knew that GIST strategy could help the students to write good descriptive text.

The next data was students’ writing score. The students did some steps to create final copy or final draft of writing descriptive text about Borobudur Temple. They were understanding descriptive text, writing 20 keywords on the Borobudur Temple descriptive text, outlining, drafting, and writing the final copy. The students got correction in the drafting steps. Then they should write the final copy. Their final draft was scored by three raters. After getting scores from three raters, the researcher counted each student’s average score.

After the researcher got data from both variables, the researcher processed the data through SPSS 15.0. As the result, this study showed that there was significant, positive, and strong correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text. Besides, this study showed that there was significant correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students writing descriptive text according to the gender.

There were some studies which could support the researcher’s study. Another study which was conducted by Sariatun (2010) with the title “The Correlation Between English Vocabulary Mastery and Students’ Writing Ability of The Eighth Grade Students of SMPIT Rahmatan Lil „Alamin Seloaji Babadan Ponorogo“ Academic Year 2009/2010”. The purposes of this study were to describe the English vocabulary mastery of the eighth grade students of SMPIT Rahman Lil „Alamin Seloaji Babadan Ponorogo, to describe the writing ability of the eighth grade students of SMPIT Rahman Lil „Alamin Seloaji Babadan Ponorogo and to describe the correlation between English vocabulary mastery and writing ability of the eighth grade students of SMPIT Rahman Lil „Alamin Seloaji Babadan Ponorogo. The students of the eighth grade of SMPIT Rahmatan Lil „Alamin Seloaji Babadan Ponorogo became the subjects of this study. The total subjects were 84 students.

This study used correlation design. For collecting the data, the researcher used test and documentation from printed sources such as note, agenda, and newspaper. There were two kinds of test in this study. They were objective test and subjective test. Objective test was for measuring the vocabulary mastery and students’ writing skill.

The results of this study were the English vocabulary mastery students were enough with the range of score between 54. The difference between the previous study and this study was the previous study used picture to compose the descriptive text. Meanwhile this study used GIST strategy or word association to compose the text. The usage of picture also related to word association. Because, every pictures had their names in the form of words which was GIST strategy used word to compose the text.

The second study was conducted by Istiqomah, Raja, and Kadaryanto (2011). The title of this study was “Correlation between Grammar Mastery and Descriptive Writing Ability”. Correlation design was used for conducting this study. The subjects of this study were the students of XI IPA of SMA N 1 Terusan Nunyai. The instruments which were used by the researcher were grammar mastery test and descriptive writing test. The researcher analyzed the data by using Bivariate Correlation. The result of this study presented that there was significant correlation between grammar mastery and students’ writing ability.

From both of the studies showed that writing could be supported by some aspects, such as vocabulary and grammar mastery. In this research, the researcher put these aspects in the writing descriptive rubric.

Another study about gender was conducted by Bijami, Kashef, and Khaksari (2013) discussed between gender issue and performance in writing. This study was conducted by descriptive design. The researchers reviewed some journals about gender differences in writing. This study showed that the teacher should more concentrate by giving more attention to male students by applying various strategies in teaching. Moreover, for male student who did not have good ability in writing. In the other hand, the male students who had good motivation in writing could performance better than who did not have good motivation.

Surya, Eliwarti, and Masyhur (2013) also conducted a study with the title “The Ability of Female and Male of The Third Year Students of English Study Program FKIP UR Pekanbaru in Writing a Synopsis of Movie”. The design of this study was comparative study. The purpose of this study was to know the ability between female and male in the academic year 2012-2013. The subjects of this study were asked to watch movie “21” and written the synopsis minimum three paragraphs.

The result of the study which was conducted by Surya, Eliwarti, and Masyhur showed that the range score of female students were higher than male students. The reason which made female students got higher score than male students is because female students felt interest were more interested in writing and learning language. They liked to write story, diary, poem, and other writing. In the contrary, male students were interested in mechanical and spatial.

Chu-Yao (2008) also conducted study about gender differences. “An Investigation of Gender Differences in EFL College Writing” was the title of her research. The subjects of this study were 70 students who were not studying in English major. There were 35 male students and 35 female students. This study was done in a national university in southern Taiwan. The students were asked two write different kinds of text. They were cause-effect paragraph, comparison paragraph, descriptive paragraph, and the last was narrative paragraph.
The result of this study showed that female students could write longer than male students. The female students had good score in some aspects, such as content, organization, grammar, and diction. Another result of this study showed that male students were good in writing cause-effect paragraph and comparison paragraph. Meanwhile female students had good writing in descriptive paragraph and narrative paragraph.

There were some results which was similar between the previous study and this study according to the gender. All the studies’ result showed that female students had better ability in writing than male students. Male students tend to ask more attention. They were good in mechanical and spatial. If male students had good skill in writing it was for writing cause-effect and comparison paragraph. These previous studies could support this study with those reasons.

The difference between the studies above and this study was the study above used descriptive design which the researchers reviewed some resources as like journals to conduct their study and comparative study. But, this study applied correlation design to conduct the study. But, both the studies had same result. That was the teacher needed to give more attention to the male students. It meant that female students performed better in writing. From discussion above the researcher knew that there was significant correlation between GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text and female students which were taught by using GIST strategy showed better writing descriptive text.

5. Conclusion

From the research finding and discussion above, there are some conclusions which are gotten, they are:
1. The calculation of Pearson Coefficient Correlation which correlates perception of GIST strategy and students’ writing descriptive text is 0.800 at 5%. It shows that there is positive and strong correlation between both variables. It means that perceptions of GIST can contribute for students’ writing descriptive text.
2. Pearson coefficient value according to gender is 0.771 for male and 0.821 for female which shows positive and strong correlation between perception of GIST strategy and students” writing descriptive text according to gender in 8th grade students of Muhammadiyah Junior High School 1 Gresik. This result shows that female students have better writing descriptive text than male students.
3. The students who have better perception of GIST strategy to be possible to have good writing descriptive text.
4. The female students have better perception of GIST strategy than the male students. It can be proved that female students have better writing descriptive text score than male students.
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