THE EFFECT OF USING KWL TECHNIQUE TOWARD STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION:
An Experimental Research in Teaching Hortatory Exposition Text at SMAN 1 Batipuh

Nurul Husna[1], Jufri[2], Fitrawati[3]
Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
FBS Universitas Negeri Padang
Email: nurulhusna26@ymail.com

Abstrak

Tujuan penelitian yaitu meninjau pengaruh penggunaan teknik KWL (*Know Want Learned*) dalam kegiatan sebelum dan sedang membaca terhadap pemahaman membaca siswa. Jenis penelitian ini adalah eksperimen dengan populasinya yaitu siswa kelas XI tahun pelajaran 2011/2012. Sampel penelitiannya yaitu kelas XI IPS 3 sebagai kelas eksperimen dan XI IPS 2 sebagai kelas kontrol. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah *Reading Comprehension Test* berbentuk pilihan ganda sebanyak 40 soal. Nilai tes di analisis dengan hasil t-*hitung* sebesar 4,42 dan t-*tabel* 2,00, yang berarti t-*hitung* > t-*tabel*. Sehingga disimpulkan bahwa penggunaan teknik KWL dapat memberikan pengaruh yang lebih baik terhadap pemahaman siswa dalam membaca.
Keywords: KWL, reading comprehension

A. Introduction

Reading is absolutely needed by foreign language students because it is an important part to be mastered in language learning. According to school-based curriculum 2006, teaching reading should be based on genre-based approach which consists of twelve text types. The second grade students of senior high school were studying three texts; narrative, spoof, and hortatory exposition text.

In reading process, the students had problems. One of them is students' reading ability is still low. The causes of that problem are from students' side and teacher's side. The causes from students' side are the students had lack of background knowledge, they were confused about what the aim of reading the text is, and the students had lack of motivation from their self to be critical readers. Furthermore, the causes from teacher are the teacher provided uninteresting materials, she/he still used conventional technique, and the teacher provided in effective media.

Based on the problem and causes of the problem above, the researcher interest in research about teaching reading by using a technique; KWL. KWL is a chart which consists of three columns; *Know, Want to know, and Learned*. The

---

first column is *Know*. In this column, the students write down about what they have known about the topic that will be discussed by the writer in the text. The second column is *Want to know*. This column is fulfilled by the students concern with what they want to know more about the topic. The last column, *Learned*, is a part of the KWL chart that is completed about what the students have learned after read the text to answer their questions.

This technique can help teacher to improve students' reading ability, especially in activating students' background knowledge becomes an active reader. Moreover, KWL helps them to know the purpose of reading text, so the students are encouraged to be a critical reader. In addition, they feel interest in reading because teacher asks them to fill the chart based on their opinion. According to Carr and Ogle (1987), students will be an active reader when they read by using KWL chart. It means that this chart can improve students' interest in reading the text because it will help to activate their prior knowledge to be an active reader and critical reader.

In this research, the researcher focused on teaching reading hortatory exposition text. It was considered based on the syllabus and semester program at SMAN 1 Batipuh, the students learned about hortatory exposition text around April to May. In addition, KWL is only suitable for teaching Expository text. This research is limited to the effects of using KWL's technique toward students' reading comprehension at SMAN 1 Batipuh, Kab. Tanah Datar.

Reading is a process of communication between the writer and the reader. Sheng (2000:1) mention that reading as the process of recognition, interpretation, and perception of written or printed material. It is a process of communication from the writer to the reader which involves the recognition of letters, words, phrases, and clauses. Briefly, reading is not only a process of communication, but also reading is a process of recognition, interpretation, and perception of written material.

Comprehension is a high level in learning after knowing and understanding. Even though the readers know or understand about something, it is not guaranteed that he or she comprehends it. According to Kustaryo (1988), reading with comprehension is to understand what has been read. It is an active process that depends on comprehension skill and student's experiences and prior knowledge. In short, reading comprehension depends on the student's experience and prior knowledge to organize the idea, the author's purpose, and to evaluate.

Furthermore, reading comprehension according to Lenz (2005) is the process of constructing meaning from the text. He adds the goals of reading instruction are ultimately targeted at helping a reader comprehend text. The process of comprehending involves decoding the writer's word and then using background knowledge to construct an approximate understanding of the writer's message.

Based on the explanation of reading comprehension above, it can be concluded that reading comprehension is the active processes of reader to identify the topic, main idea, supporting details or idea, understand synonym and antonym of the writer's message by using background knowledge and experience, thus the

readers have to infers them to obtain implied information have to understand and infer from certain parts or the whole text.

In senior high school, teaching English have to base on curriculum, KTSP or *Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan.* Teaching English now is integrated in senior high school level. Teachers are not focus on teaching a skill for each meeting, but they are asked to teach by using genre based approach. Teaching reading activity consist of three stages, pre-reading, whilst reading, and post-reading. In pre-reading, the students are introduced with the topic and make prediction about the text with the teacher's guide. Meanwhile, in whilst reading, the students read the text completely and increase their reading strategies. The last is in post reading which the students do exercise and re-check their prediction about the text before.

Based on the curriculum, teaching reading process by using genre based approach. Hortatory exposition text is a kind of monolog text which studied in senior high school. Kholidin (2010) says that hortatory exposition text is a text which represents the attempt of the writer to do something or act in certain way. The purpose of the text is to influence and persuade the readers by presenting the supporting arguments. This text has three element, they are thesis, argument, and recommendation. So, hortatory exposition is a kind of text to persuade the reader to do or should not to do something.

KWL is a kind of technique used in teaching reading process. It is a chart which consists of three columns. According to Fischer (2005), KWL chart is vertical diagram in which students make three columns. The first column is labeled what I know, the second what I want to know, and the third what I learned.

Teaching reading by using KWL has several procedures. Conner (2006) mention that there are several procedure for teaching reading by using the KWL chart strategy. (1) Choose a text. (2) Create a KWL chart. (3) Ask students to brainstorms word, terms, or phrases, they associate with a topic. (4) Ask the students what they want to learn about the topic. (5) Have students read the text and fill out the L column of their charts. (6) Discuss the information that students recorded in L column. (7) Encourage students to research any question in the W column that were not answered by the text.

Based on the explanation above, the purpose of this research is to see the effect of using KWL technique in teaching reading of hortatory exposition text at senior high school level. This research is applied in second grade students who learn hortatory exposition text at this semester.

B. The Research Method

The kind of research used experimental research because it can show the effect of using KWL technique for students' reading comprehension. This research was conducted in two groups, experimental and control groups. The experimental group was taught by using the KWL technique. According to Gay (2009) the experimental groups is a group that receives a new treatment. Meanwhile the control group was taught as usual.

This research used pretest-posttest control group design which both of groups got pretest in the first meeting and posttest in the last meeting. The population of this research was second students of social science at SMAN 1 Batipuh and the sample were 62 students of XI IPS 2 and XI IPS 3. The control group was XI IPS 2 and XI IPS 3 would be experimental group. The instrumentation of this research was multiple choice tests which consist of 40 questions and the time around 75 minutes.

The researcher used content validity to measure validity and test-retest reliability to measure the reliability of the test. Cresswell (2008:169) says that in test-retest reliability the researcher administers the test at two different times to the same participants. Then the scores are reliable and they are at positive correlate if they are similar. The procedure of this research is the experimental group was taught by using KWL in pre teaching and whilst teaching. Meanwhile, control group was taught by using conventional technique.

C. Discussion

In this research, the data or students' pretest and posttest scores would be analyzed. According to this data, they were significantly different of scores before and after doing this treatment. In control group, the pretest and posttest scores were not significantly different because this class was treatment by using conventional technique. Meanwhile, in experimental group looked significantly different between pretest and posttest scores. The following tables show the students' pretest and postest scores of Experimental and control groups.

Table 1. Pre-test and post-test score in experimental group

Students' Code	Pretest	Posttest
1	70	90
2	40	77,5
3	65	75
4	60	67,5
5	60	67,5
6	57,5	77,5
7	55	65
8	45	87,5
9	47,5	82,5
10	52,5	77,5
11	45	75
12	60	72,5
13	65	85
14	60	72,5
15	62,5	87,5
16	67,5	82,5
17	50	75
18	60	70

19	62,5	75
20	60	72,5
21	65	77,5
22	60	72,5
23	60	75
24	67,5	67,5
25	65	82,5
26	62,5	70
27	65	87,5
28	60	65
29	47,5	77,5
30	60	75
31	65	82,5
32	47,5	77,5
33	45	72,5
Σ	**1915**	**2517,5**
Mean	**58,03**	**76,28**

Table 2. Pre-test and post-test score in control group

Students' Code	Pretest	Posttest
1	62,5	80
2	60	65
3	57,5	65
4	57,5	77,5
5	62,5	80
6	57,5	75
7	60	77,5
8	50	52,5
9	62,5	60
10	57,5	42,5
11	50	75
12	57,5	60
13	57,5	85
14	60	62,5
15	45	70
16	45	65
17	57,5	37,5
18	57,5	62,5
19	67,5	45
20	62,5	70
21	50	77,5

22	52,5	60
23	60	75
24	62,5	32,5
25	65	42,5
26	52,5	50
27	62,5	60
28	57,5	70
29	50	67,5
Σ	**1660**	**1842,5**
mean score	**57,24**	**63,53**

The following table gives more details about mean, standard deviation, variance, maximum, and minimum of pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control groups.

Table 3: **Recapitulation of the Students' Pre test Scores in Both Experimental and Control Groups**

	Experimental Group	Control Group
Number of students	**33**	**29**
Mean	58.03	55.51
Standard Deviation	7.87	9.55
Variance	62.01	32.74
Max	70	67.5
Min	40	45
Sum	1915	1660
$t_{observed}$ = 1.18 t_{table} = 2.00		

From the table above, the mean scores of the experimental group were 58.03 while the mean scores of control group were 55.51. It can be said that both groups have similar scores. After calculating by t-test, it was found that $t_{observed}$ was smaller than t_{table} ($t_{observed} < t_{table}$ = 1.18 < 2.00). It means that there is no significant difference between the students' pretest scores in both groups. Therefore, both groups can be compared.

Table 4. **Recapitulation of the Students' Posttest Scores in Both Experimental and Control Groups**

	Experimental Group	Control Group
Number of students	**33**	**29**
Mean	76.28	63.53

Standard Deviation	9.63	13.83
Variance	45.35	191.3
Max	90	85
Min	65	32.5
Sum	2517.5	1842.4
t $_{observed}$ = 4.42		
t $_{table}$ = 2.00		

From the table above, the mean scores of the experimental group were 76.28 while the mean scores of the control group were 63.53. It can be said that both groups are different. It could be also proved from the results of t $_{observed}$ before which was higher than t $_{table}$ (t $_{observed}$> t $_{table}$ = 4.42 > 2.00). It means that there is a significant difference between the students' posttest scores in both groups.

D. Conclusion and Suggestion

After analyzed and calculated the pretest and posttest scores of both groups, it was obtain that t calculated was 4.42 while the value of t table was 2.00, and the level of significant 0.05. It means that the t calculated was higher than t table. Therefore, the hypothesis H_1 that stated "The KWL technique will give better effect toward students' reading comprehension rather than conventional technique." was accepted. While H_0 that stated "The KWL technique will not give better effect toward students' reading comprehension rather than conventional technique." was rejected.

Based on the finding, the researcher gives several suggestions, such as: English teacher should use some interesting, creative, and educative activities to activate students' background knowledge in teaching reading, teacher can apply KWL technique not only for teaching hortatory exposition text, but also for teaching another texts, and for the next researcher should apply KWL technique in teaching another genre and have more meeting times to see the improvement of students' comprehension maximally.

Note: this article is created based on writer thesis with Advisor 1 Drs. Jufri,M.Pd and Advisor 2 Fitrawati,S.S., M.Pd

Bibliography

Conner, Jennifer**.** 2006. Instructional Reading Strategy: KWL (Know, Want to know, Learned). Retrieved from: http:// www. Indiana.edu/~I517/KWL.htm On November 4, 2011

Creswell, John W. 2008. *Educational Research (3rd edition)*. New Jersey: Pearson Edu, Ltd.

Fischer, Max W. 2005. "*No child left behind" places premium on reading instruction in content areas*. Education world. Retrieved from: *http://www.educationworld.com*. On October 15, 2011

Gay,L.R. 2009. *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Kholidin, Didin. 2010. *Hortatory Exposition text*. Retrieved from http://smanpluspropriau.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=96:hortatoryexposition&catid=65:bahasa-inggris&Itemid=103. On October 2, 2011

Kustaryo, Sukirah. 1988. *Reading Techniques for College Students*. Jakarta. Retrieved from: http://titikhujan11.blogspot.com/2009_04_01_archive.html. On October 16,2011

Lenz, Keith.2005.*Special Connection*.Retrieved from: http://www.specialconnections.ku.edu. On October 15, 2011

Ogle, Donna & Carr.1987.*Using "KWL" in the Classroom*. Retrieved from: http://www.teachervision.fen.com/graphic-organizers/skill-builder/48615.html. On September 15, 2011.

Sheng, He Ji.2000." *A Cognitive Model for Teaching Reading Comprehension*." Retrieved from : http:// forum.state.gov. On October 3,2011.